

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 14, 1968

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

FRUIT FLY (COMPENSATION) BILL

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS**ROBE BOAT HAVEN**

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question about the deepening of the inlet into the Lake Butler boat haven at Robe?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: The entrance channel into Lake Butler is always silting up, and a careful watch is constantly kept on the depth. Periodic dredging is carried out to maintain the declared depth of 6ft. low water but, as such dredging is very costly, it is usual to excavate the channel down to 10ft. low water so that the frequency with which the work has to be done is kept to the absolute minimum. This leads local people to assume that the declared depth is 10ft. low water, tempts vessels of near that draft to use the lake, and initiates premature reports of siltation as the depth slowly creeps up to the official declared depth of 6ft. low water, as promulgated in Notice to Mariners No. 16 of 1964, which states:

At Robe, a sheetpiled canal, approximately 60ft. wide and with a depth of 6ft. at low water, has been constructed connecting Lake Butler to the sea.

A clear channel 6ft. low water exists today, the soundings on which were taken last June. However, the time is approaching when further maintenance dredging will have to be carried out, probably in the new year.

EASTERN STANDARD TIME

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the suggestion made by the public to bring South Australian time into line with time in the Eastern States?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The matter of adopting a standard time for Eastern States and South Australia has not been considered by the Government, and no definite representations have been made to the Government in connection with it. The matter of standard time was mentioned at the Premiers' Conference in June last by the Premier of Tasmania, who informed the conference that it was considered that daylight saving had been a success in Tasmania and a Daylight Saving Bill was before the Tasmanian Parliament. He pointed out the desirability of a standard time for the Eastern States of Australia, Tasmania, South Australia and the Northern Territory, and undertook to contact the Premiers of the States and the Prime Minister after a decision had been made concerning the Bill before the Tasmanian Parliament.

BOARDING ALLOWANCES

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Will the Minister of Education obtain details of the dates on which the boarding allowances for secondary and tertiary students were last fixed and of the basis of that fixation?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I shall be pleased to do that.

FOOTPATH COSTS

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the responsibility for the cost of constructing footpaths in front of the Oakbank Area School?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: The Minister of Local Government informs me that the power of district councils to levy charges for construction of footpaths, pursuant to section 328 of the Local Government Act, is confined to such works within a township. The rural lands mentioned by the honourable member are within the boundaries of the defined township of Oakbank and, accordingly, the district council has the power to make such charges. This matter is entirely a domestic responsibility of the council.

TEACHER'S SUSPENSION

Mr. HUDSON: Yesterday, I asked the Minister of Education whether any decision had been reached in relation to the suspension of Mrs. McLellan from teaching at Seacombe

High School and, in reply, the Minister said that at the time I was asking the question Mrs. McLellan was being interviewed by the Director-General of Education, and that a decision would be made shortly. Has she details of that decision?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The Director-General interviewed Mrs. McLellan in the presence of the Director of Secondary Education on the afternoon of August 13, 1968, and the actions and decisions that he has taken are as follows:

(1) He has lifted the suspension on Mrs. McLellan and asked her to report to the headmaster for duty at Seacombe High School this morning, Wednesday, August 14.

(2) He has severely reprimanded her and fined her the maximum amount permitted to him under Regulation XXVIII (39), namely, \$2.

(3) Mrs. McLellan will not be paid for the afternoon of August 2, when she was absent without leave.

(4) She will be paid her normal salary during the period of suspension.

PARILLA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week about the Parilla township water supply?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Early in June this year, a request was made by the Engineering and Water Supply Department to the Director of Mines for drilling, casing and pump testing a new 8in. diameter bore at Parilla. On completion of the drilling and when results of the tests of the bore are known, the department will be able to proceed with further work to increase water supplies for this town.

Mr. NANKIVELL: As this matter is urgent and as the winter season is fast closing, will the Premier ask the Minister of Mines whether the Mines Department cannot expedite the work?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to obtain that information.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. McKEE: Since July 25, I have been trying to obtain information from the Premier and the Attorney-General about standard gauge railway work being carried out between Port Pirie and Broken Hill and about negotiations between the Commonwealth Government and the States concerned and the Silverton Tramway Company. However, on each occasion I have received a firm "No" to my request for information. I noticed on the front page of this week's *Recorder* a full statement containing the information for which I had been asking.

This was released by the Minister of Transport to the press in my district. Will the Premier say whether it is to be his Government's future policy to withhold answers to questions until the Minister concerned has released the relevant information to the local press circulating in members' districts?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: No, the Government does not intend to withhold information in that manner at all, and the member will know that that is not so. The answer he received yesterday, which was given through me by the Minister concerned, related to a question he asked that was not properly based: the honourable member asked for information about a non-existent meeting. I understand that the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, has an answer for the honourable member about negotiations with the Silverton Tramway Company.

Mr. McKee: It's a bit late.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If the member still desires a reply, he may obtain it from the Attorney-General.

Mr. McKEE: As the Attorney-General has been generous enough to inform me that at long last he has a reply to a question I asked about gauge standardization and the over-pass at the Solomontown junction, will he now give me that reply? I hope he does not read from the *Recorder*.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not intend to read from the *Recorder*, but I think that, in view of the comments made by the honourable member and the questions he has asked, I owe the House a detailed explanation. The questions he asked me yesterday, implying a complaint about the delay in answering questions, caused me considerable perturbation because, as members will be aware, both the Minister of Roads and I, who form such a good team, have attacked our work with much vigour and energy, and we do not like to keep people waiting for replies. On July 25 the honourable member asked me the following question:

Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Transport for a report on the progress of work on the Broken Hill to Port Pirie line and on when work is likely to commence on the Solomontown over-pass section?

I told him I would obtain that report, and then on August 1 he asked me whether I had a reply. I said I had not, and naturally I followed up the matter again. However, on August 6, which is a week ago yesterday, and I think before the report appeared in the *Recorder*, the honourable member asked me the following question:—

The **SPEAKER**: Order! As this matter has been controversial, I do not wish to restrict the Minister's reply, but I think this is becoming more of a Ministerial statement. Can the Minister assure me that this is a reply?

The Hon. **ROBIN MILLHOUSE**: Yes, Sir. On August 6 the honourable member asked me the following question:

Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, a reply to my recent question about work on the standardization of the Broken Hill to Port Pirie line and about the over-pass at the Solomontown junction?

Although that is the question regarding which he now asks a reply, I gave the honourable member the reply on August 6, as follows:

I have a report which states that the work between Port Pirie and Cockburn is proceeding satisfactorily and that this section is expected to be ready for conversion to standard gauge operation in December, 1968. Regarding the Cockburn to Broken Hill project, preliminary work is already in hand pending the ratification of an agreement between the Commonwealth, New South Wales and South Australian Governments. Under present planning it is hoped to call tenders for earthworks and bridges towards the end of September, 1968. Plans for the over-pass structure at Solomontown are nearing completion, and these will be submitted for the approval of the Commissioner of Highways during August. Tenders for carrying out the work will be called following receipt of this approval.

Therefore, the questions about which the honourable member now complains were answered by me in this place eight days ago, and I suggest that in future the honourable member check his files or his memory a little more closely.

HOME FOR AGED

Mr. **EDWARDS**: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to the question I asked on July 31 about a home for aged people to be built at Ceduna?

The Hon. **G. G. PEARSON**: As mentioned in my earlier reply, the Commonwealth subsidizes homes for the aged and, provided that the promoters of a scheme to build housing units or infirmaries for aged persons meet the conditions imposed under the Aged Persons Homes Act, it will subsidize the project on a \$2 for \$1 basis. The subsidy extends to the purchase of land and the legal fees associated therewith, and the Commonwealth Government prefers that the buildings be new and not older houses adapted to the purpose. Full information in booklet form can be obtained from the Commonwealth Rehabilitation Centre, 411 Payneham Road, Felixstowe.

Information regarding the State Government subsidy on furnishings and equipment for the homes is available from the Chief Secretary's Department.

SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS

Mr. **BROOMHILL**: Recently I asked the Minister of Education if she would be good enough to consider a matter brought to my notice in relation to school textbooks. It had been pointed out to me that school book lists were often not provided to students until early in the school year. I drew the Minister's attention to the trouble this created for some parents who wished to shop around for secondhand books. Can the Minister now provide some information on this matter?

The Hon. **JOYCE STEELE**: The question of making book lists available at the end of the year instead of at the beginning of the following year was investigated by the Education Department a few years ago. It was found that difficulties associated with the fixing of prices for the delivery of books and the uncertainty of many students over the subjects they would be studying would render impracticable the preparation of book lists in quantity at any other time than the beginning of the year. On the other hand, a selection of textbooks has always been made before the end of a year, and there are clear advantages in such information being made available to parents. Therefore, headmasters display book lists in this form on notice boards before the end of the year. If, in fact, this is not being done in all cases, a reminder will be sent to headmasters. Most students who buy secondhand textbooks get them from fellow students at the same school, usually at the beginning of a school year. There are shops to be noted for parents who wish to shop around for secondhand books, in that care is needed to ensure purchase of correct texts and editions.

CITRUS

Mr. **ARNOLD**: As newspaper reports in the past few days have stated that, because of lack of markets and insufficient returns, citrus groves have been cut down in their prime, will the Minister of Lands ask his Commonwealth colleague whether free orange juice can be provided at schools?

The Hon. **D. N. BROOKMAN**: I will take up the matter with the Commonwealth Minister. I believe that, although this suggestion has been made on a number of occasions previously, it has not been implemented. In answering this question, I should like to say

in passing, in relation to stories of citrus trees being taken out, that anyone contemplating such action should first contact the Lands Department, from which he might receive good advice on the matter.

Mr. Arnold: Whether or not the trees are pulled out, there is still a big surplus of citrus.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: True, but I suggest that people who contemplate pulling out trees would be well advised to consult the department before doing so.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked some time ago about the dumping of edible oranges?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture reports:

Each season a proportion of the orange crop is discarded for one or more of several reasons, including weather conditions, mechanical damage in packing or harvesting, pests and diseases. This applies in varying degree to all horticultural crops, but other factors leading to the rejection of navel oranges relate to the requirements for export marketing. At present this State contributes about 60 per cent of the total Australian citrus exports, and the Citrus Organization Committee's export policy has been to ensure that the fruit is in a fit condition for export and that acceptable standards are maintained to meet the requirements of buyers. It is inevitable that each season a quantity of fruit is delivered for export that comprises unwanted sizes and grades, and a large percentage of the total quantities of navel oranges dumped would have been this "over-run" fruit. Growers are asked to harvest their fruit selectively for export to prevent this wastage.

This season, red scale has been particularly troublesome, and weather conditions have caused serious breakdown of skin texture, resulting in oleo-cellosis, which has affected large quantities of the crop destined for export. Berri Fruit Juices Co-operative Limited, the largest processor in the State, has processed into juice some 3,000 tons of navel oranges. The Citrus Organization Committee and Berri Fruit Juices Co-operative Limited are exploring all avenues to establish new markets for this product. The citrus surplus problem is not confined to this State: all produce markets in Australia are heavily over-supplied. Moreover, the adverse harvesting conditions have affected the timing to catch all export markets. While allowance must be made for human errors in grading, most of the fruit dumped would have been classified as unmerchantable for one or more of the reasons referred to.

I also have a letter which was received by the Minister of Agriculture from the Citrus Organization Committee and which is much too long for me to read. It is too difficult for me to condense the letter reasonably but,

as its contents are fairly relevant, I will make it available to the honourable member and to any other members interested.

WAYVILLE INTERSECTION

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my recent question about the installation of traffic lights at the intersection of Goodwood and Greenhill Roads?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague reports that the installation of traffic lights at the intersection of Goodwood and Greenhill Roads is expected early in 1969. Completion of roadworks for the intersection is held up by one outstanding property acquisition.

MOSQUITOES

Mr. CLARK: Has the Premier a reply to my question of August 6 regarding a survey of mosquito-breeding habits in parts of the Port River estuary in the Salisbury and Port Adelaide council areas?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: A subcommittee has been formed, consisting of an entomologist from the Agriculture Department, the chief inspector, assistant chief inspector and a senior inspector of the Department of Public Health, and an inspector from each of the Port Adelaide, Salisbury and Enfield Local Boards of Health. This subcommittee, co-ordinated by the chief inspector, will direct and participate where necessary in a survey of the breeding source and habits of mosquitoes in the area during the whole of the coming spring and summer. When the results of the survey are known, it is expected that a more efficient and less expensive control method will be devised. No spraying is contemplated for this coming summer, as this would affect the breeding habits and ruin the value of the proposed survey.

CLARE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. ALLEN: In this year's Loan Estimates, provision is made for the building of a new high school at Clare, and the people in the Clare district are delighted with that announcement. I understand that in 1965 plans were drawn up for a high school to accommodate 300 students, but in the meantime the St. Joseph Convent Secondary School in Clare has closed and a Matriculation class has started at Clare. As 430 students at present attend the Clare High

School, will the Minister of Education ascertain whether the department's plans for the new high school can be revised to accommodate the extra students?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will obtain a further report for the honourable member on this matter, but I point out that the plans to be submitted to the Public Works Committee would be held up if the design were varied to incorporate extra accommodation.

ROADWORKS

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to the question I asked last week about the reconstruction of roads after they have been dug up by other Government departments, including Commonwealth Government departments?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague reports that the reinstatements, following work by other authorities, of roads for which the Highways Department is responsible is done with the knowledge of and under the supervision of Highways Department officers. However, all reinstatements are difficult to compact in depth and some subsidence or movement is generally in evidence later. This problem is accentuated by wet weather conditions. Officers of the department inspect new reinstatements regularly but, under heavy traffic, subsidence and surface deterioration can develop and extend rapidly.

WALLAROO ROAD

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my question about work on Cornish Terrace, Wallaroo?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague reports that Highways Department officers are co-operating in every way possible with the Wallaroo Corporation concerning the construction of Cornish Terrace. The department has a large and continuing programme of pavement testing and subsequent laboratory investigations. Staff shortages in the materials section are critical and all work must be dealt with in order of priority.

Mr. HUGHES: I am sure the people who grow grain on Yorke Peninsula in the council districts of Kadina, Bute and Clinton will not be consoled by the reply. For the information of the Minister of Roads, these people met in the council chambers at Wallaroo some time ago in support of having a Government grant made in connection with the building of this

road. In the letter that the council wrote to me to bring before the Minister, it was stated that soil tests had been submitted six weeks prior to the time of the writing of the letter, which was July 30. That was when I directed the question to the Minister. It is now August 14, so it would be between eight and nine weeks since the soil was submitted for analysis. In view of this, will the Attorney-General get an undertaking from the Minister of Roads that the results of the analyses of the soil tests will be made available to the Wallaroo corporation in time for it to be able to have this road constructed in preparation for the expected heavy grain-carting traffic on it? If this road is not built in readiness for the coming harvest, it will be necessary to divert the traffic through the middle of the town, which will cause a bottleneck for receivals at the Wallaroo silos.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask for a report for the honourable member.

ABORTION

Mr. CASEY: I was keenly interested in a recommendation passed by the Liberal and Country League conference regarding legal abortion in this State, as reported in the editorial of the *Advertiser* of Tuesday, August 13. According to the editorial, the recommendation is that abortion should be permitted, first, when it is necessary, in the opinion of two doctors, in order to preserve the mother's life; secondly, when the mother is pregnant because of rape or when she is under 15; and, thirdly, when it is reasonably certain that a child may otherwise be born with a gross deformity. As this is a recommendation by the L.C.L. conference, can the Attorney-General say whether he is likely to introduce legislation to implement it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am glad to know of the honourable member's interest in what went on at the L.C.L. conference: it must remind him of the good old days. I must tell him, however, that if the report of the resolution is as he has read out it is not quite accurate, and I was present during the debate on this matter.

Mr. Jennings: The press wasn't allowed in.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, but I assure the honourable member that it was an excellent debate.

The SPEAKER: Order! We are not having a debate on this matter, you know. It is only an answer to a question.

Mr. Jennings: Put him in his place, Sir. You couldn't keep him there.

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member may be asked to leave if he is not very careful.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The resolution was, in effect, a request that the Government examine whether legislation on this matter should be introduced. It was not a request directly to introduce legislation, but a request to examine the situation. I have no doubt that, when that request reaches the Government through the usual channels, it will be acceded to.

JERVOIS BRIDGE

Mr. RYAN: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads, the information I sought about whether work on the new Jervois bridge was on schedule, and also about the expected completion date?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague reports that the Jervois bridge will not now be completed as originally scheduled. Some engineering problems associated with pile driving have arisen and these have created delays. The original expected completion date for the whole project was August, 1969, and this is now back to November, 1969. The new bridge will be opened to traffic in April, 1969, to permit demolition of the old structure.

SMITHFIELD-MODBURY ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my question of August 7 regarding work on the Smithfield-Modbury road?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague reports that progressive improvement to sealed surface standard is planned over the next three years for the Smithfield-Modbury Main Road No. 99, between the Main North Road and One Tree Hill. Provision has been made for the work to commence in the current financial year. Completion of the remaining unsealed sections between Golden Grove and Sampson Flat will follow.

MCDONALD PARK SCHOOL

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about the McDonald Park Primary School, Mount Gambier?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: When the contract for the erection of the McDonald Park Primary School was let, it was expected that the school would be ready for occupation in February, 1969. However, as the honourable member knows, it has not been possible for the contractors to proceed with the work,

because of the unusually wet conditions. The Public Buildings Department reports that it is expected that the school will now be ready for occupation in May, 1969.

THEBARTON SCHOOL

Mr. LAWN: Can the Minister of Education say when the Government intends to rebuild the Thebarton Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will obtain a report for the honourable member and bring it down as soon as possible.

OPAL FIELDS ROAD

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Roads to the question I asked on August 7 about roads to the opal fields of Coober Pedy and Andamooka?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague reports that there is little likelihood in the immediate future of providing roads in the Far Northern area of a better standard than that already existing, that is, graded earth formations with limited lengths of gravel. However, with the appointment of additional engineering staff to the area, it is expected that, with improved programming, the grading of the roads will be possible at closer intervals, as the additional engineers will supply more overall supervision. Their duties will also include investigating the relocation or resiting of sections of such roads as the one to Andamooka.

WEST BEACH SCHOOL

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of August 7 about progress on constructing the new West Beach Primary School and whether the school will be ready to open for the 1969 school year?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: A contract for the construction of the West Beach Primary School was let in October, 1967. Construction is proceeding according to the plan that the school buildings should be completed by the end of this year, and it is expected that the new school will open in February, 1969.

GREENHILL ROAD

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Roads a reply to my recent question about improvements to Greenhill Road?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague reports that the provision of car parks on Greenhill Road between Goodwood Road and Glen Osmond Road is a matter for the

Corporation of the City of Unley. Financial assistance cannot be made available to councils for car parks. The further development of this section of Greenhill Road is listed for commencement towards the end of this financial year. Any present expenditure on areas of the road reserve for parking would, therefore, now be economically justified.

NORTHERN ROAD

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Roads a reply to the question I asked on August 7 about plans for a new North-South road?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague reports that the construction of the Stuart Highway from Port Augusta to the Northern Territory border is essentially a long-term project. Highways departmental funds are insufficient to permit large-scale expenditure on this road unless roadworks in the metropolitan and rural areas are curtailed considerably. Such a policy would be unacceptable and not in the best interests of the State. My colleague will make a personal inspection of this road early in September. A feasibility study on the economics of upgrading this road is being conducted by the Highways Department, and further consideration will be given to the project when this is to hand.

STOBIE POLES

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Local Government a reply to my recent question about stobie poles?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague advises that the question of undergrounding of electricity cables is a matter in which he has a real interest and desire to improve the living conditions for everybody. Preliminary investigations have commenced and suggestions for pilot schemes have been made. The costs of implementing such pilot schemes will be the subject of future conferences.

SCHOOL CHARGES

Mr. CLARK: A letter appearing in this morning's *Advertiser* states:

We have all heard about free school books and Government interest and concern to see that all children are adequately educated. One would expect that a widow bringing up five children on a pension of \$26 a week would receive Government help to pay State secondary school charges for materials used in art and handicraft lessons.

However, neither the Education Department nor the Social Welfare Department makes any allowance . . . Equally distressing is the fact that, in the case of pensioners' children, fees for the public examinations are still payable by the parent. Since these fees are \$6 and upwards, they represent a considerable sacrifice to needy families.

I am most interested in this problem, because the writer of the letter lives at Brahma Lodge, which is in my district. Also, last week two lady constituents of mine came to see me, one of whom, a deserted wife, is finding it difficult to make ends meet, as she is worried about the cost of school extras that have to be paid for, such as sewing, drawing material, and sports fees, and she has asked me to help her. This afternoon, just before the House met, a gentleman came to see me to tell me how difficult it was for his friend, a constituent of mine who lives at Gawler South and who is unemployed because of injury, to pay Intermediate examination fees for his two children. Indeed, he would not have been able to pay except that a good friend of his came to the rescue and lent him money—and I do not know how he intends to repay it. Will the Minister of Education obtain a report on these and similar matters to see whether there is any way to assist such people, because I am certain that instances such as this occur not only in my district but are common to many districts?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: After reading the letter to which the honourable member has adverted, I referred the matter to officers of my department for a report. I suggest that the people to whom the honourable member has referred write to the department explaining the situation and asking whether anything can be done to help.

Mr. BROOMHILL: I am pleased that the Minister of Education had already called for a report on this matter. In recent weeks I have received several complaints from parents in my district who have found that the imposition of these fees has caused some difficulty. I think this has arisen because third-year students who have already attended high school for two years without examination fees being imposed are required to pay, I believe, \$6.25 within a short time. I suggest to the Minister that she consider informing parents of children in the Intermediate classes early in the year that they can expect this money to be required at mid-year and during the final term. I would also like the Minister to consider the parents of children who are provided with free textbooks at high

school, as these people are the most severely affected by the imposition of this fee. I understand that if these parents, who are obviously in poor circumstances, cannot find the fee, their children are required to take their examination at another place. Will the Minister consider these factors when considering the overall report she will receive?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I shall be pleased to inquire into these matters.

SEATON SCHOOLS

Mr. HURST: For about five years now the Seaton Primary School and Seaton Boys Technical High School Committees have been experiencing considerable difficulty in establishing playgrounds at the respective schools. Although that difficulty was reasonably overcome, difficulty was experienced in obtaining water for the playing areas. Last year a bore was sunk by the Engineering and Water Supply Department to water the playing areas in both schools. Consultations took place between the two school committees and officers of the Education and Public Buildings Departments in relation to the desirable type of irrigation system for use on school playing areas and in relation to minimizing the cost and providing some form of satisfactory standard equipment. Last year, the Public Buildings Department undertook to draw up plans and tender specifications for an irrigation system for both schools. As the committees have now been waiting for about three years to plant the area concerned, and as no plans and specifications have yet been received, will the Minister of Works ascertain the reason for the delay? The children in both schools have been deprived for far too long of a playing area. The committees concerned having co-operated to the utmost, I believe they deserve the courtesy of receiving a little more prompt attention than they are receiving.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Although I have no knowledge of the delay to which the honourable member has referred, I will certainly ascertain why a delay has occurred and whether prompt action can be taken.

ORROROO SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: On being elected member for Rocky River, I inherited much correspondence concerning the Orroroo school's request for water to grass portion of its oval. Having personally investigated the matter, I could see no reason why the area concerned could not be connected to the Orroroo water scheme.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot express an opinion or debate the question.

Mr. Casey: He is doing very well, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: He is out of order.

Mr. VENNING: As this problem has existed for many years, will the Minister of Works ascertain why this area cannot be connected to the Orroroo scheme?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will see whether I can settle this matter.

WEIGHBRIDGE

Mr. WARDLE: In the township of Murray Bridge, as a private weighbridge is open for only a restricted number of hours during the day, any carrying company that is loading at night is not able to check a load on that weighbridge. However, a mile and a half east of the town there is a Highways and Local Government Department weighbridge. A few days ago a local carrier, who was loading a new commodity and who went across to the weighbridge to check the weight of the load, found that it was 8 tons 13cwt. and was immediately charged with having an overweight load. Will the Attorney-General ascertain whether the Highways and Local Government Department weighbridge can be made available, during certain hours on certain days, as a public weighbridge?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will find out and bring down a speedy reply.

CLOVERCREST SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: The Minister of Education will recall that, on July 25, I asked her for a progress report on the proposal to build a new primary school at the corner of Wright and Kelly Roads, Clovercrest. This project had been referred to the Public Works Committee for a report. In her reply, the Minister said that problems had arisen concerning road development near the site and that the report of the Public Works Committee was being delayed pending the release of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study report. As the Minister will be aware, that report was released on Monday and the Public Works Committee report, stating, as expected, that the project had been rejected because the site was unsatisfactory, was tabled in Parliament yesterday. Because of the urgent need for a primary school in the area to relieve the pressure on the neighbouring Strathmont and Para Vista Primary Schools, will the Minister assure me

that the Education Department will immediately investigate the possibility of purchasing a new site for a primary school in this area?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: When the reports of the Public Works Committee were tabled yesterday, I immediately referred the matter of this proposed primary school and the rejection of its site by the committee to the officers of my department, asking for a report to be prepared forthwith. As I expected that the honourable member might ask a question about the matter, I hoped that I would have the report this afternoon. This is a matter of some concern because one of the difficulties has been the unavailability of suitable sites for a school in the area. I expect to have a report tomorrow, when I hope to be able to tell the honourable member what steps the department intends to take.

DRIVING LICENCES

Mr. HURST: Has the Treasurer a reply to my recent question about examinations for obtaining driving licences?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister of Transport reports:

Administrative arrangements exist between the Motor Vehicles and Police Departments that enable learners or aged persons to undertake practical driving tests at the nearest police station if they live in the country, or at stations nominated by the Motor Vehicles Department if they live in the metropolitan area. These stations are determined according to areas and are arranged in the best interests of the public as well as those of the Police Department. In cases of hardship, arrangements can be made through the nominated station to have the test conducted elsewhere.

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST

Mr. HUDSON: In referring to the Renmark Irrigation Trust during his presentation of the Loan Estimates, the Treasurer said:

The grant portion of the advances was originally proposed in the Revenue Budget last year, but was subsequently met from Loan Account. All funds expected to be required this year are included in the Loan Estimates. The actual payments to the Renmark Irrigation Trust during 1967-68 are shown in the Loan Estimates as \$100,000. Presumably that is the sum to which the Treasurer referred, namely, the amount of the transfer that took place from the Revenue Budget to the Loan Account. Can the Treasurer say when it was decided to transfer this amount for the last financial year from Revenue Account to Loan Account? If he cannot, will he obtain this information for me?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will get the information for the honourable member.

ABATTOIRS REPORT

Mr. McANANEY: I understand that the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board must present a report to Parliament every three years and that a report is due this year. As Mr. McCall has made a report on the abattoirs, can the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say whether that report will take the place of the triennial report and be made available to Parliament or whether it is a private report that Parliament will not see?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will obtain a reply for the honourable member.

CEDUNA POLICE

Mr. EDWARDS: With regard to maintaining law and order at Ceduna, which covers the Thevenard area, the member for Semaphore has taken it on himself to assist me. I am concerned at the difficulties that have occurred in this area as a result of extra transports travelling through it and the increased trouble with the Aboriginal population. Will the Premier take up with the Chief Secretary the question of having an extra police officer stationed at Ceduna?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be happy to take up this matter with my colleague.

SAND

Mr. HURST: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of July 24 regarding the removal of sand from foreshores?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Local Government reports:

From inquiries made of the Mines Department it has been confirmed that the lease held by S.A. Silicates Company Proprietary Limited does not provide for variation or for resumption except for non-compliance with mining regulations. As these regulations are being observed, resumption would require acquisition of the land under the Lands for Public Purposes Acquisition Act or by a special Act of Parliament. In either case payment of compensation could be heavy. It has been ascertained that the company's lease is on the landward side of the unformed foreshore road reserve. This leaves about a 15-chain wide strip of dunes between the lease area and the high-water mark. Under the lease the company could excavate to any safe depth, but it is understood that sand removal below the level of Military Road is not proposed. If this understanding is maintained, and because the foreshore strip is excluded from excavation, there should be no permanent damage to the coastline in this area. With reference to the second part of the question, land between Bower Road and Bournemouth

Avenue is under consideration for the proposed scheme of development at Upper Port Reach. It is not proposed to proclaim this area as a public reserve at present.

DENTAL HEALTH

Mr. CASEY: I direct my question to the Premier, because I think it involves Government policy. In his Opening Speech the Lieutenant-Governor said that the Government was considering the establishment of dental clinics at Whyalla, Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Peterborough and Murray Bridge and in the Upper Murray areas. People in the Peterborough district are anxious to see that this scheme is put into operation as soon as possible, because there is a limited number of dentists in the northern areas of the State. Will the Premier say when the Government is likely to establish dental clinics in country towns, more particularly Peterborough?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I think the honourable member will realize that there is a programme for training a limited number of dental therapists—I think 10 or perhaps 12 a year. This means that it will be some time before such clinics will be provided throughout the State. I will obtain a report for the honourable member from my colleague setting out his considered opinion.

ANGAS CREEK

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the consequences of letting Murray River water flow down Angas Creek?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The matter of providing bridges or crossings across both the Torrens River and the Onkaparinga River has been raised by a number of people on a number of occasions since the department in 1954 first started to use these rivers to convey pumped water into Millbrook and Mount Bold reservoirs. The previous most recent request was referred to the Crown Solicitor, who stated that in his opinion the Minister of Works was not required by law to provide a bridge or other crossing. As the Minister is not required by law to provide bridges or crossings, and as to provide any would establish a precedent that could lead to demands for many such crossings on the Torrens River from near Mount Pleasant to the Gumeracha weir and on the Onkaparinga River from Charleston all the way downstream to Mount Bold reservoir, it is considered that no bridges or crossings should be provided by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Any landowners experiencing difficulty or inconvenience as a result of the department's use of the river to

convey water to its reservoirs are advised to contact the E. & W. S. Department, which will make an officer available to examine the particular problem and advise on the best method to overcome the difficulty.

MODBURY INTERSECTION

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads a reply to my question of August 6 about the intersection of Golden Grove, Montague and Main North-East Roads at Modbury?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Roads reports that the design of the intersection of the Main North-East Road with Montague and Golden Grove Roads is proceeding. The survey has been completed and acquisition of land commenced for the associated approach length of the Main North-East Road. It is expected that construction will be commenced toward the end of 1969.

FLUORIDATION

Mr. LANGLEY: Over several years, but more particularly recently, I have received over 100 letters and telephone calls and several deputations concerning fluoridation. In reply to a question by the member for Barossa, the Premier supplied a list of reference books available in the Parliamentary Library. These all seem to favour fluoridation. However, I know that some people do not agree with the Government's decision to fluoridate the water supply. I quote from a document from the United States of America, which states:

Discards of fluoridation, listed below, are carefully suppressed by the fluoride promoters. These discards were made in many instances because of the extreme corrosive damage to the water equipment or because many people claimed they became susceptible to continued dose of the deadly, toxic, poison fluorides—used commercially to etch glass—and that they suffered from inflamed mouths, burning throats and stomachs or the peculiar stiff joints described in expert medical testimony before the Congressional Committee, H.R. 2341, May, 1954. 160 communities (nearly 3,000,000 people) discarded artificial fluoridation, after using it, as of July, 1967. Compiled by Mrs. Arthur R. Robinson, Seattle, Washington. (Verified to the best of my ability.)

I do not want to read the list of the cities and councils concerned. The report continues:

In addition, 3,000 communities have defeated it by popular vote or had it defeated or rejected by action of alert city councils. Counting Alaska and Hawaii, 140,000,000 Americans are still not fluoridated! Why risk the health of more people? We, too, can suffer from any of the above ailments. (Sgd.) V. E. Bryant.

Finally, we see:

Note: The News Letter of the American Dental Association 9/1/61 lists 174 communities as having discontinued fluoridation. We have not been able to verify so many.

As this information gives another side to fluoridation, which leaves food for thought for all concerned, did the Minister of Works know of these cases and will he say whether the way will be open for people to voice their opinions by the ballot box, which opinions, by these comments, show anything but full support for something that will affect most South Australians?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I listened with great interest to the article that the honourable member read out at some length. I cannot say whether or not I have read that article but I have read many similar ones, and I have to admit, too, that I have read many articles more convincingly in favour of fluoridation. The Government has made its decision based upon its studies and the recommendations it has received. The Government respects the views of opponents of fluoridation. The decision has been made and, as the Premier when announcing it to the House said, the way is open for any member to question the Government upon this or to speak or move a motion on it. The Government has made a decision and does not intend to hold a referendum.

Mr. CASEY: My question relates to the Premier's recent announcement that South Australia's metropolitan and country water supplies will be fluoridated. I have recently received many letters that reveal not exactly hostility, but certainly much disquiet on this matter. As one person said, it is a breach of the democratic rights of an individual for him to be told what he has to do and when he has to do it. This person goes on to say:

Our water at present is murky and full of muddy sediment. If the Liberal Government is so keen to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars, why not spend it to supply the public with clean water?

I recently had dinner with several leading doctors in Adelaide who are my personal friends, and they were rather concerned, too, because they say the whole purpose of fluoridation is to build up a person's bone structure. This can be done in many different ways and, consequently, worldwide medical opinion on fluoridation is divided. Can the Premier say whether all these factors have been considered

and whether the medical authorities were consulted in any way before the announcement was made?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I said earlier that the decision was taken after long years of consideration by members of the Government. The honourable member will realize that this has been a contentious subject in this House; in fact, an all-Party committee investigated it and, by a majority decision, approved fluoridation. The honourable member knows that all members have had many years to consider this matter, and certainly Government members have done a great deal of reading of reports on it. As a result of the support given by properly constituted bodies of the medical and dental professions, and as a result of all the information available to it, the Government made its decision and stands by it.

Mr. CASEY: The medical people to whom I spoke did not agree with it.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Representative bodies of the medical and dental professions here agree with it, and I understand that representative bodies overseas also agree with it. This support, together with all the information available to the Government, was sufficient to enable it to make up its mind.

PORT PIRIE HOSPITAL

Mr. McKEE: In the 1967-68 Loan Estimates \$100,000 was proposed for certain improvements to the Port Pirie hospital. The Minister of Works recently advised me by letter that these proposals would have to be submitted to the Public Works Committee. Will he say whether they have been submitted and whether work will be commenced this year?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I do not think they have been referred. I think a case has been prepared for referral but I will check that and let the honourable member know.

INTEREST RATES

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Treasurer a reply to a question I asked on August 7 about an increase in interest rates announced by the various banks and the effect that such increases would have on flat building and the rentals charged by the Housing Trust for flats?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have obtained the following report from the General Manager of the Housing Trust:

Since the recent increase in interest rates referred only to borrowing rates for those taking out mortgages, it necessarily follows that the increase would not have any effect on any

Housing Trust rents. However, referring to the specific points, it is true that the trust intends to finance its increased flat programme with about three-quarters of the capital being provided by Commonwealth-State funds and one-quarter by semi-government funds. It follows from this that any increase in semi-government rates would have some small effect on the rents that would have to be charged. Naturally, any increase in the Commonwealth long-term borrowing rate, which would automatically increase the rate at which Commonwealth-State funds were borrowing, would have a much greater effect on trust rents. Fortunately, the long-term rate seems stable at the moment.

TRAFFIC SIGNALS

Mr. HURST: Has the Attorney-General, obtained from the Minister of Roads a reply to a question I asked on August 1 about traffic signals?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Roads reports that there are about 100 intersections within metropolitan Adelaide that presently justify installation of traffic signals. These have been listed in order of priority based on traffic volumes and accidents, and installation is generally proceeding in accordance with these priorities. In some cases, these priorities have to be varied because of (1) conformity with other roadworks or public utility works in the vicinity; (2) delays occasioned by land acquisition; or (3) non-availability of local government subsidies for the lights. Generally, the installation of traffic lights at specific intersections has been delayed by the above reasons rather than shortage of Government funds for this purpose. The Highways Department expenditure for traffic lights over the past five years has been: 1964-65, \$9,800; 1965-66, \$12,300; 1966-67, \$64,400; 1967-68, \$105,400; and 1968-69, \$213,000 (budgeted amount, which is more than twice the amount for 1967-68).

BEACHPORT WATER SUPPLY

Mr. CORCORAN: The Minister of Works may be aware that, for the past 12 months, investigations have been taking place in Beachport with the object of locating a satisfactory and suitable supply of water for the township area. I understand that a bore has been sunk to fairly considerable depth. Also, I have noticed that \$50,000 is provided on the Loan Estimates for work in the township of Beachport in the coming financial year. Will the Minister inquire what progress has been made with the investigations to which I have referred and what work is intended to be carried out in this financial year regarding the Beachport water supply?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I recall seeing recently in a report on this matter that some difficulty was being experienced in the drilling for this bore. However, I will bring myself up to date on this matter and advise the honourable member.

CABINET

Mr. LAWN: This afternoon in the Legislative Council a Liberal and Country League member of that Chamber asked the honourable Chief Secretary whether there were to be Cabinet changes soon. Possibly the honourable member was referring to the change of Premier, but he did not say what the changes were. To the surprise of everybody, the Chief Secretary replied that the Cabinet members from the Legislative Council did not mingle with the members of the Cabinet from another place. Will the Premier say whether this is a fact, and whether the Government comprises two Parties and Cabinet meets in two groups, or whether the Chief Secretary is making a mis-statement?

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable Premier wish to reply?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am somewhat astounded. We are very pleased to see the honourable member back in our midst, and he seems to have come back with a new interest in politics. I greatly appreciate his interest in my Party. However, I can tell him that it is a very solid Party indeed.

Mr. Hudson: Solid from the neck up!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As the member for Adelaide knows, my Party is putting forward a policy that is aimed at extensive development in this State. I assure him that I shall study his question closely, but I say very firmly now that the Government is united in the policy that it is pursuing and that it appreciates the honourable member's support.

BILLIARDS TOURNAMENT

Mr. LAWN: As you know, Mr. Speaker (having been connected with the Joint House Committee for many years), the committee runs each year a billiards tournament for members who are interested in the game. I understand that the third round of the 1967 tournament has not yet been finalized because the Premier and the Chief Secretary have not yet played. Will the Premier say whether it is a fact that he and the Chief Secretary do not speak to or mingle with each other?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It is a long time since the Chief Secretary and I have been in conflict. We have constant contact with each other in the political sphere and in the

business of Government. However, I will ascertain whether the Chief Secretary can adjust his busy programme, which he is carrying out on behalf of the State, to coincide with my programme, for I should like to oblige the honourable member by having this game finalized. I should be happy if the honourable member would care to referee it.

ROYAL PARK SCHOOL

Mr. HURST: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about the Royal Park Technical High School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The new secondary school planned for erection at Royal Park is a high school, not a technical high school. Working drawings and specifications have been begun, and present planning is for the building to be started in 1969.

DEPARTMENT'S EFFICIENCY

Mr. GILES: I have received various suggestions that have the objective of trying to improve the efficiency of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. These suggestions are as follows:

1. That equipment in one of the department's plants be listed and not removed from the plant unless signed for.
2. That all work carried out in the department's headquarters workshop be recorded so that it can be traced.
3. That all work for each station and the time taken on the work be listed.
4. That repairs be carried out by only qualified people.
5. That all materials taken from any departmental store be signed for.
6. That consideration be given to permitting the use by the district for charitable purposes of land belonging to the department but not required for the department's use.
7. That the Minister examine the circumstances in which repairs to Mr. Mick Fennell's departmental house at Woodside were carried out, the repairs being the replacement of an element in the stove, for which I am told that ultimately nine men and five vehicles were involved.

Will the Minister of Works consider these suggestions?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I thank the honourable member for his interest in this matter, and I will certainly look into the rather interesting suggestions that he has made.

WEED CONTROL

Mr. HUGHES: Last October I received from the District Council of Bute a letter asking whether I would take up with the Government of the day the necessity of having made available more machinery for weed control on railway property. At that time I read the letter to the House, and the text of the

reply given then was that departmental officers had been provided with such equipment as was appropriate to the tasks undertaken. Naturally, I thought at that time that the Railways Department was adequately taking the measures necessary for weed control, but apparently that has not been so, because after the last meeting of the council the following report by Mr. Williams, an authorized weeds officer, was issued:

Mr. K. Williams, authorized weeds officer, in a short report, said that salvation jane and false caper are prevalent in the Melton railyards. He had contacted the district foreman three times on the matter, but the Railways have only one Mistrite machine for weed control work from Moonta to Port Pirie.

It seems from the report by Mr. Williams that the Railways Department has not available adequate machinery to cope with weed control on railway property in the northern areas. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Transport whether the department will provide more equipment to enable the railway gangs to adequately control weeds in the northern areas?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

SURREY DOWNS SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about when the Surrey Downs Primary School is to be occupied?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The Surrey Downs school buildings have been completed, but the abnormally wet conditions have delayed the completion of site works and the construction of paved areas. An effort is being made by the contractor to stabilize the soil and to provide sufficient asphalt for the children who will attend. As soon as the weather enables the paving to be finished the school will be occupied.

PARINGA PARK SCHOOL

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning vacant land held by the Education Department at Paringa Park?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Although it is unlikely that the vacant land held by the Education Department at Paringa Park for primary school purposes will be required for several years, any use of the site for community playing purposes could be considered only on a short-term basis. If the city of Brighton is interested in using the land on this basis, a submission should be made to the department setting out details of proposals for the development of the area for playing purposes.

STATIONMASTER'S RESIDENCE

Mr. EVANS: The Housing Trust has recently built a stationmaster's residence at Mount Lofty, and the back of this residence faces the Sturt Valley Road. A galvanized iron fence has been erected along three sides of the residence, much to the disgust of the neighbouring house owners. After I approached the Minister on this matter, the fence was painted and capped. The offended people, however, still object to this unsightly fence, and a letter from one such person states:

I thank you for your interest, and I read the reply of the Minister of Transport and I must say that I found his attitude annoyingly condescending. Unlike me, he does not have to live opposite the offending party and has not the dubious advantage of inspecting the stationmaster's draped clothes line from any of the upstairs windows. In short, I am not at all satisfied that the application of a tin of paint and placing the piece of wood on top of the galvanized iron has really done very much to change the situation. It is my opinion that the rights of individuals in situations like this are being increasingly ignored by various Government agencies. I sincerely doubt whether anyone connected with this erection had any thought for the effect it would have on the surroundings. Thank you again for your interest.

Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Transport to investigate this problem with the object of further moves to remove this feeling of discontent?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be happy to take the matter up with my colleague.

ZEBRA CROSSINGS

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads a reply to my recent question concerning the installation of a zebra crossing on King William Road, near Opey Avenue, and the future installation of zebra crossings in this State?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague reports:

The provision of pedestrian crossings is the responsibility of the local government body in whose area the crossing would be installed, not the Highways Department. If the local government body considers such a crossing to be necessary and agrees to its installation, it can seek the necessary approval from the Road Traffic Board.

ANZAC HIGHWAY

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads a reply to my recent question concerning the future use of the area along Anzac Highway once used as a bicycle track?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague reports that the Highways Department is currently investigating the widening of Anzac Highway to provide for bus bays and other service areas. However, the construction of these facilities is likely to be very costly as stormwater drains and other public utilities would have to be relocated. Additionally, some tree removal would be necessary. Traffic volumes in metropolitan Adelaide are likely to reach such proportions, particularly on arterial roads, that it will not be feasible to allow parking at all times in front of shops that abut these roads.

HILLS CORNER

Mr. GILES: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Roads a reply to my question of August 8 concerning a dangerous corner on the road between Carey Gully and Uraidla?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague reports that the improvement of a single curve on a section of road where the whole alignment is of low standard is of doubtful traffic value. Also, there is almost a certainty of wasteful expenditure if the geometric alignment and complete design are not first done for the entire section. A fairly high expenditure would be required for the further slight improvement of even one curve. For these reasons, and because of the low general road priority, the work sought should not be undertaken at this time.

KIDNEY MACHINES

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary how many kidney machines are under the control of the Hospitals Department, when the last one was purchased, and how much it cost?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to obtain that information.

RENTAL ACCOMMODATION

Mr. HUDSON: I have previously raised with the Housing Trust the question of the shortage of rental accommodation in my district, a position that is symptomatic of the whole of the south-western suburbs.

Mr. McAnaney: Has it improved in the last three years?

Mr. HUDSON: It is much the same now as it has been in the last three years, because very little land is available for development. The report of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study has possibly altered the situation in that the freeway that was previously proposed to run through my area slightly to

the east of Morphett Road has now been discarded. Over the years the Highways Department has resumed a large area for this proposed freeway, including the original site (as the Minister will probably recall) for the South-Western District Hospital. Now that this land will not be required for a freeway, some of it could be used for housing development and, as it is Government land, it could readily be purchased from the Highways Department and made available to the Housing Trust to provide flats and other rental accommodation in the south-western suburbs. This move would help to overcome the present long waiting time, which is a minimum of three to three and a half years.

Mr. Rodda: Is this a speech or a question?

Mr. HUDSON: It is a question. Will the Minister of Housing discuss with the Housing Trust and with the Minister of Roads the possibility of this land, which can now be used for other purposes, being taken over by the trust so that it can provide rental housing and rental flats?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member having fully explained this question, I will discuss the matter with the trust.

WHYALLA SCHOOL

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about a third secondary school at Whyalla?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The acquisition of the site for a third secondary school at Whyalla has been discussed with the South Australian Housing Trust, which is preparing subdivision plans for the area. The site for the secondary school cannot be defined until these subdivision plans are complete, but the urgency of the need for this school is clearly understood by all concerned.

PETERBOROUGH RAMPS

Mr. CASEY: On behalf of pensioners in the town of Peterborough, I suggest to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, that, because of improvements to buildings and the construction of new buildings at Peterborough, it has become necessary to construct ramps leading to the main streets of the town. Pensioners are concerned that no hand-rails have been provided, although the ramps are steep. As I understand that requests are to be made to the Railways Commissioner to provide hand rails, will the Attorney-General support this request and ask his colleague whether these hand rails can be provided?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am not sure of the exact nature of the question, but I will refer the statement to my colleague.

Mr. CASEY: I must apologize if I was not specific in asking the question. Will the Attorney-General take up with the Minister of Transport the possibility of providing for the benefit of pensioners hand rails on the newly-constructed ramps at Peterborough, so that these people may hold on to rails permanently fixed in the walls of the ramps?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

TAPLEY HILL ROAD INTERSECTION

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Attorney-General received a reply from the Minister of Roads to the question I asked on August 6 about a school crossing being provided at the junction of Dumfries Avenue and Tapley Hill Road?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague reports that in April, 1968, the Woodville council informed the Road Traffic Board that it had carried out investigations into the need for a school crossing, following requests from parents and school committees. It was found that the number of children crossing the road was far below the minimum number that the board considered necessary to justify the provision of an authorized school crossing equipped with flashing amber lights. The council considered that a pedestrian refuge on Tapley Hill Road would provide the necessary protection for the children, and sought approval to install such a refuge. The Road Traffic Board approved the installation of a refuge at its meeting of May 23, 1968. A pedestrian refuge would enable the children to cross one stream of traffic at a time and to stand safely in the refuge in the centre of the road whilst waiting to cross the other stream of traffic. The Road Traffic Board will keep the position under review and, at a later time, should the occasion demand it, the need for a school crossing will be reconsidered.

SPEED LIMIT SIGNS

Mrs. BYRNE: On October 25 last year I asked a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Roads about speed limit signs being erected on Montague Road between Bridge Road, Ingle Farm, and Nelson Road, Para Vista. This area is not in my district, but I am interested in it because people travelling from Modbury to, say, Para Hills or through to the abattoirs use this road, and it is frequently used by my constituents. The reply I received last year suggested three

solutions to the problem, the third being to have the Road Traffic Board introduce speed zoning regulations, but this involved a lengthy investigation, administration, and erecting many signs. I was disappointed with the reply I received at that time. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads to reconsider this matter so that the Road Traffic Board can erect some signs on this road? I cannot see any reason to erect many signs. In fact, I consider it would be sufficient if signs were erected at the end of this road.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Now that the show is under new management, I will certainly refer the matter to the Minister, and I hope that a more favourable reply can be given to the honourable member.

REGISTRY OFFICE

Mr. HUDSON: My question is in two parts: first, will the Premier take up with the Chief Secretary the possibility of the office of the Principal Registrar of Births, Deaths, and Marriages (particularly as it applies to the latter) being open to the public for longer hours than is at present the case? Secondly, will the Premier obtain for me from the Chairman of the Public Service Board information concerning the practice applying to public servants who obtain leave to get married in a civil service at the registry office during ordinary office hours?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will take up this matter for the honourable member.

WATER RESOURCES

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into and report upon the water resources of South Australia, the effect of drainage thereon and the possibilities of conservation, and to make recommendations for the effective utilization of such water.

I thank members for their indulgence in allowing me to amend my motion so that it relates not only to water resources in the South-East but to such resources throughout the State. Although I may be more particularly interested in the situation existing in the South-East, the Minister of Works has pointed out to me that the matters to which my motion refers affect the whole State and are already being considered in different forms. If a Royal Commission is to inquire into the possibilities of adequate water conservation in this State, we shall have to have much more knowledge than has been available hitherto.

One of the problems concerning water conservation in South Australia relates to the fact that work in this regard has been undertaken on a piecemeal basis. Although some projects have been investigated intensively, none of the work undertaken on this matter has been completed. I am concerned (and have been for about 10 years) more parochially with the position that exists in the South-East, because I know a little more about the problem affecting that part of the State.

In about 1948 or 1949, the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization carried out some work in the hundreds of Field, Glyde and Colebatch and inquired into the availability of water in an area that had been taken up for war service land settlement. This work was undertaken near what is now Naranga station, and it was established that the ground water in the area (water available for stock) was not of local origin; in other words, it did not accumulate in the area as a result of local rainfall but was of more distant origin. In 1960, Mr. E. P. D. O'Driscoll, who was Senior Geologist in the Mines Department, produced a bulletin (No. 35 in the department) in which he speculated on the information then available. This publication was a treatise on the hydrology of the Murray basin province of South Australia. Although I say he "speculated", Mr. O'Driscoll gave an intelligent account of his observations in the light of the information available at the time. Indeed, much of what has been said on the matter in the House, particularly by me, has been the result of perusing that publication, as well as the result of having studied the problem in detail at first hand.

While I was fortunate to be the Chairman of the Land Settlement Committee, I had more definite contact with people involved in drainage, and I also had the opportunity to study more fully the water situation in the South-East. Observing the situation closely, I found that what was happening farther south, although it was not happening in my district, was directly affecting my district, and it is still doing so. Consequently, I have made a point of trying to understand the problem as fully as I can. However, the more one tries to understand the problem, the more difficult it becomes to obtain any definite information. Much of what is known about the water situation is based on premise and, more latterly, on research work that has been carried out. Although this work has been supplemented by the activities of the Mines Department, I

point out that the work undertaken thus far is inconclusive: only isolated small problems have been examined, and no large area has been examined completely. Consequently, the picture is not one that can be looked at as a whole.

Drainage started before the turn of the century but, more importantly, since 1947 (when the Western Division drainage was stepped up in order to provide additional land for war service land settlement), the whole question of drainage has become completely different from that which existed prior to that period. This is because that land was held in more extensive areas, and people had a mixture of country (both high and flat land) and it was no problem if flooding occurred. Indeed, people looked forward to the flooding of their plains because of the resultant extension of the growing season, which continued until late in the spring.

However, when we had war service land settlement established and the flats had to be drained so that they would be sufficiently free of water to enable them to be farmed continuously throughout the year, the situation changed. Initially, with a series of wet years, the problem of over-drainage did not appear to be so acute. There is no question now, however, that after a run of drier seasons drainage is affecting pasture land in the South-East and, indeed, is having a major effect on the overall water resources of the area. In 1923 a Royal Commission was appointed to investigate South-Eastern drainage. The Commissioners (Messrs. George Kermode, Walter John Colebatch and Daniel Findlater) accumulated much evidence between May 9, 1932, when they received their commission, and September 16, 1925, when their report was presented to the House. Indeed, there were requests for drainage to be undertaken over a vast portion of the south-eastern portion of the State to bring it into agricultural production.

We find now that at the most recent drainage inquiry the majority of people oppose further drainage in the South-East. Of course, this is not new, because opposition to drainage was evident during the period in which I was a member of the Land Settlement Committee; and it has become an increasingly stronger voice in the South-East community, possibly as a result of the run of dry seasons we have experienced. Notwithstanding this, it could have resulted from a change in agricultural

practices and because this land once in production is mostly sown to pasture that can withstand flooding.

Also, some people are using successfully the run-off water from some drains, and I refer particularly to Drain B. About 18 months ago, when the Land Settlement Committee took evidence on the Penola drain, people came from that area and presented evidence which did not strictly relate to the subject of our inquiry. However, this evidence was taken because a pattern of thinking was starting to build up. Those people asked that there be no further drainage because they wanted the floodwaters on their properties, as it was of value to them. Another landholder (Mr. Harold McDonald) gave considerable evidence to the committee that there was a unique situation on his property which had a natural holding basin known as Sheep Wash Swamp. He gave us much information that he had collected on the movement of water in the Baker Range drain, which ran past his property, and of the volume of water that he was able to trap in that swamp. He pointed out that as a consequence of this natural advantage, he was able to irrigate naturally, by gravitation, an area of about 6,000 acres. His evidence, and that of other people, pointed to a different concept of land usage and a different attitude towards this problem.

Latterly, there has been an increasing demand that weirs be put into drains so that the flow would be impeded. This was referred to by Mr. O'Driscoll in his report which was published in 1960, and which contained evidence that proved that in some localities the drains were affecting adjoining country up to about 30 chains on either side of a drain. It has been suggested that weirs would affect ponding and hold up the ground water tables in the area, provided that those tables can be held within 2ft. of the surface. This would be ideal for the growth of perennial pastures.

Last year the Mines Department started a more intensive survey of the area around Padthaway and other South-East areas. Because the drought year caused a demand for holes to be drilled for irrigation, the department took advantage of the situation and was able to build up an increasing store of knowledge over a much wider area of the general geological pattern of the strata underlying the top soil, and of the extent of some of these basins. I understand it has subsequently carried out a measurement of water levels in a series of bores across

the hundreds to try to establish what movement of water takes place and, if water does move, whether it goes east, west, north or south.

Mr. Jennings: Or up or down.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I thank the honourable member for Enfield. In fact, it has been proved that it moves down. I have not often seen water move up. The position here has been further amplified by other work which has been carried out by the Commonwealth Scientific Industrial Research Organization, particularly by Professor J. R. Holmes, the Professor of Earth Sciences at the Flinders University. Work was carried out in an area around Nangwarry in relation to the effect of pine forests on ground water levels. This was indeed an interesting exercise in that it established successfully the point that the honourable member for Enfield refers to: that there are pockets of subsistence in this area up to 90ft. deep in the strata. It was evident in two localities around Tarpeena and Nangwarry that there were two depressions which took in water and fed it to the lower aquifers.

Actually, there are three different water levels in the South-East, apart from the run-off surface water. There is the one known as the Gambier water in limestone; beneath that is the pleistocene, again water in a sandy limestone, then the Knight Sands group, which is so very important to the South-East, because from this the best water is supplied, not only in quality but in quantity. This aquifer provides the flowing bores that are associated with the fringe of the basin around the Kingston-Beachport area, and that edge of country where springs or bores are overflowing. This has become the subject of control, as there is a regulation before the House for this area to be proclaimed for water preservation. We have this supply of water apparently as a result of rainfall over the whole of the area. The rain fills the first basin and, through the depressions to which I have referred, it feeds the water lower down.

One of the problems in this respect is to ascertain the volume of supply. Most of the surplus water comes to the area from the highlands of Victoria along the border between Victoria and South Australia. It runs into South Australia in a series of creeks, which flood out on to the plain. More recently substantial development has taken place in Victoria in this area. At this time it would not be possible to assess whether the development has resulted in more water coming to South Australia or whether, in fact, less is coming from these sources.

I point out that these are the extra sources of water that establish our underground supply in the event of a run of dry seasons, because this is water in addition to that which normally falls on the ground. Also important are questions such as the extent of the catchment area, the quantity of water moving in from that area, and the quantity of water that can be stored in the various aquifers. The question of where this water comes from and where it moves to is also important. It is not known whether the actual pumping of some of these basins does not increase their capacity. After all, if there is no shortage of water moving in, the supplies in the subterranean strata may in fact be enlarged by pumping and not depleted. This is an interesting point about which I do not think anything is known at this time. In the Address in Reply debate I referred to underground stream water running to the sea at Eight Mile Creek. I am told that a similar stream of water is evident at a place called the Piccaninnies, one of a series of springs around the southern coast. Apparently, these are largely associated with the whole of this underground basin. I believe we do not have particular knowledge of these waters. However, we are assisting them to drain out of the State and we might well be able to put them to some better purpose.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that "Orders of the Day: Other Business" should have been called on at 4 o'clock and the bells rung, but this has been overlooked. Therefore, I interrupt proceedings now and call on the member for West Torrens to move in connection with Orders of the Day.

Mr. BROOMHILL (West Torrens): I move:

That "Orders of the Day: Other Business" be suspended and taken into consideration after "Notices of Motion: Other Business" are disposed of.

I point out that I move this motion with the agreement of members concerned with the "Orders of the Day: Other Business".

Motion carried.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I breathe a sigh of relief. I was trying to work out how I was out of order; I did not know why I was being asked to sit down on this particular subject.

Mr. Jennings: That doesn't mean you have to start again.

Mr. NANKIVELL: No, I will not do that. In addition to the work that has been done recently by the Mines Department, I understand that two officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department have been looking more specifically at this question

whether the supply of water in the South-East is so unlimited that we can think in terms of pumping it to the metropolitan area. I believe much work has been done by these two engineers during the past 12 months and that one, a Mr. Hicks, has made a departmental report to the Minister about the matter. However, I understand that, if this sort of project was to be developed, it would require an area something similar to that at Polda where the people are told, "This is an area where we shall catch water for pumping purposes and you will not be able to irrigate from this area; you will be able to graze stock over the area but we want the riparian rights (if I can use that term) to the underground water in this area for the purpose of providing a water supply for the State."

Of course, this leads to an interesting further development whether this is, in fact, a reasonable proposition, and, if it is, whether there is not an area to which drainage water (that is ground water) could be directed in order to supplement a basin from which water would be pumped for use elsewhere for domestic and stock purposes. The big problem with which we are confronted in respect of all this is the fact that there is so much speculation and empirical argument because there is a tremendous amount of knowledge still required before anyone can be certain of these particular facts.

There are various ways whereby this problem can possibly be overcome. I believe the Mines Department is understaffed in the section dealing with this matter. The Hydrology Branch has only six hydrologists for the whole of the work of South Australia. This is why much of the work has been done piecemeal. If a problem develops at Eyre Peninsula at Polda, where an underground water basin has to be developed for stock and domestic supply and where thorough investigation is needed, these officers, who have been working somewhere else, must be transferred and put on that project. Also, officers of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization have been working on specific problems, but they have not been necessarily looking at this question because, after all, it is a State matter. I repeat that the Engineering and Water Supply Department has recently been looking at the problem, not from the point of view of the utilization of the water of the area but more particularly from the point of view of the utilization of the water for State purposes. I am concerned with both these aspects, and that is why the general text of the motion has been changed.

I do not intend to talk about other water sources, such as Polda; I have merely referred to it. I do not intend to deal with Chowilla dam or additional dams on the Murray River. Also, I do not intend to go into the possibility of water from the Murray River and the lakes being trapped in the Coorong and put to better use than is the case now. However, I point out that the whole of the future development of the South-East (which is the better rainfall area of South Australia, an area that has possibly the most potential for increased production) depends upon the certainty of unlimited irrigation water for intensive production. It will need to be able to guarantee intensive production if people are to be able to maintain their present returns on the limited acres that are available to people on some properties. In this instance I refer to some of the blocks held by war service land settlers. Although these blocks are fairly marginal by present standards, these settlers might be able to supplement their production by the use of further irrigation. There are prospects for 20,000 acres of vines in the area around Padthaway and Keppoch. Here again, the question is not only that this area is of a suitable soil type and a suitable climate but that it has underground water, supposedly in unlimited supply, for irrigation.

In the same area there is a substantial small seeds industry building up, but again there is need for guaranteed supplies of water to ensure its continuation. It could well be that vegetable production could take place in many of these areas. This, too, would require an assurance of water, because root crops and surface vegetable crops require a considerable quantity of water. We do not want a repetition of the Virginia situation that occurred on the Adelaide Plains, where people thought that the water supply was unlimited and that they could go into this form of intensive production without risk. I contend that we want to prevent this from happening in the future by being able to tell people what the prospects are, whether or not they can irrigate, what area can be irrigated safely, and what volume of water can be pumped safely.

This applies in a general sense to the farming area. In addition, there is no question that from a State point of view we need water. If we use our drainage waters and if, with some means of conserving them so that we can pump extensively from the area, we provide a supplementary supply to Adelaide without in any way affecting the overall production, this

is something else we cannot discount because very soon, if we do not provide for extra storages, we will soon run out of storage capacity. Indeed, we are running out of storage sites now. We may soon have to consider desalination or some other means of providing water for the State's development. I consider, therefore, that the time has come to take more definite steps than just speaking every year about this matter in the Address in Reply debate, and I have brought this matter to the attention of the House in the form of a motion requesting that a Royal Commission be set up to inquire into and report on these matters.

I believe this to be in the interests of the State and I believe the information that will need to be collected in the process of providing information to such a Commission will answer many of the questions being asked by people concerned with drainage in the South-East at present. It will possibly give some assurance of the continued potential for development in the area. The same exercise could be continued in other areas with potential for further development by means of irrigation (and these areas exist in the Murray Mallee). There has been an extensive irrigation plant running at Murrayville in Victoria, just over the border from Pinnaroo, by the Bethune company where they have been testing big pumps. That company has been pumping vast quantities of water over a long period of time now, and I think it has established the practicability of irrigation in that area. Again, it is all subject to costs and returns. The water there is again possibly related in some way to this other water, and the whole is inter-related to the aquifer south of Adelaide. The Adelaide Plains supply is different; the local Adelaide supply is different; and the Poldas supply is different; but all these areas have their peculiar problems. I believe there is a definite need to collate the evidence required to piece together the story of water resources, the need for conservation, and the practicability of further conservation, and to make the fullest inquiry into the use of this water to the best advantage of the people of the State.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I second the motion and commend the member for Albert for bringing this matter before the House. The commodity we need most in South Australia is the one of which we have the least. No-one will argue that, if we do not have an adequate supply of this commodity, no matter what the Government's policies are the State will not advance far. Like the member

for Albert, I am personally interested in the South-East and I support the motion, which states that a Royal Commission should inquire into the water resources of the whole of the State. This matter is a wide and important one from what I have seen in my own district and, recently, in some of the other areas of the State to which the member for Albert has referred, such as Poldas. I was privileged to see the wonderful supply of water in the limestone area in the Poldas Basin and to learn from the member for Eyre that water is running into the sea at Sheringa. This further highlights the need for a Royal Commission to seek advice and gather information relating to the whole of the State, because even if we just think of the vast potential on Eyre Peninsula and if full and proper use is made of the water we see there even in a cursory glance what a benefit this would be to that part of the State. Although we have experts in various Government departments, such as the Mines Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and although they have the necessary facilities to carry out much of this development, we should seek the help of private consultants. As this matter is such a vast subject and as there are certain matters on which I should like to carry out research before concluding my speech, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE BILL

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for a Parliamentary Committee of Public Accounts. Read a first time.

WATER CHARGES

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): I move:

That in the opinion of this House, the increase of 20 per cent in charges for excess water places an undue burden on the community, particularly market gardeners, householders and country residents, and should be reviewed.

This motion should commend itself to members on both sides, and in particular those representing country districts. I urge that it be considered in the light of the arguments I shall adduce. In producing arguments in favour of the motion, I assure the Minister of Works that it is not submitted in any way as an attempt to embarrass him or his department. I appreciate the fact that this matter was brought to his notice earlier this session and that he undertook to look at it, and it was

only after his reply given to questions raised not only by me but also by other members that I felt this motion was necessary.

I was disappointed in the reply although it was not unexpected because I believe it was not his but that of the department: it accords with the thinking of the department on this matter for some years. It is time we obtained the thinking of this House on this matter because it is serious for South Australia. I stress that we are not asking for the gate to be opened to the irresponsible or unrestricted use of water. Nobody understands better the value of water than people living in country areas who have had to do without water. It is to the credit of this State that, although South Australia is the driest State in the Commonwealth and one of the driest areas in the world, there are areas of South Australia with an average rainfall of about 8in. a year that have had no water restrictions imposed on them since 1933. Of its reticulation system the State may well be proud. It represents a co-operative effort on the part of Government departments, both Commonwealth and State, that has taken water into dry places. So much of South Australia could not live today without a reticulated water system. We recognize that and its importance to the State.

Port Augusta, Whyalla and Woomera (not to mention many other places) could not live today without the adequate water supply available to them. However, we must not open the gates to the wastage of water by the irresponsible use of it, however much may be paid for it, but so important is water to the occupation of these areas that any substantial increase in the cost of water is a serious impost on the areas concerned. Water is the life-blood of the State. I have been told (and the former Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, used to tell us frequently) that there is a sufficient mileage of mains in South Australia to reach from here to Calcutta. We know that we could not live without those mains and that they are useless without water to fill them.

Another problem facing us now is that the water in those mains is of no comfort to the people along the mains unless they can afford to use it. The provision of water is a great challenge to the Government and to the people. It is more urgent and necessary than the provision of any other service by the Government: water is more important than roads and communications. It is a first component and essential before industry can be established, before townships can be built. If there is to

be any further expansion in South Australia, two questions must be asked: First, can an adequate water supply be made available? Secondly, can it be provided at a cost that will enable people to live or industry to become established?

I draw special attention to several points about this last impost. First, I do not like the way such imposts are levied. No warning is given to anybody that an increase is impending. An announcement is made and we find it refers to the fact that the charges have been increased two or three days before the making of the announcement. The people of South Australia are entitled to something better than that. We had every reason to believe there would not be an increase in charges. The people co-operated with the Government to the extent that the worst drought for years was weathered without the need to impose water restrictions. Voluntary restrictions were self-imposed in a co-operative effort that reflected great credit on the people, and it was after the drought was over and the rains had come that this Government saw fit to impose this savage increase in the price of excess water.

The next matter that displeases me is the way in which the impost has been levied. The fact that it has been levied on excess water means that the whole of the increase would be borne by people living outside the city of Adelaide and that it would be borne more heavily by people who have, of necessity, to use a greater quantity of water than is used by those who are fortunate enough to reside in areas with a heavier rainfall. Because it is not possible for everyone to live within such areas, someone has to go to the dry areas, and I think that the State has reason to be proud of those who have been prepared to establish industry and homes in these areas.

I emphasize again that no intimation was given before the last election, or immediately after, that an increase in charges was pending, but if an increase was necessary it could have been more evenly shared than it will be under the present proposals. This impost will affect fewer than 3 per cent of the water consumers in the city. Only 30 per cent of all the water users in the metropolitan area use excess water, so 97 per cent of the water users in the city of Adelaide and 70 per cent of all the water users in the metropolitan area will not have to pay an increased charge. However, the country people who depend on the use of water for their livelihood will be paying this impost.

Mr. Casey: But doesn't the Government always claim to support country interests and to be the saviour of the country people?

Mr. RICHES: All kinds of claims are made and I want to lift this debate above Party political considerations if I can, because I have said that Government members, when asking questions, have said they are concerned about this matter. I consider them to be vitally concerned and I confidently expect that, in addition to expressing this concern in questions, if this motion is voted on, they will allow themselves to be counted among those expressing an opinion which I cannot accept as being contrary to the opinion of the Minister, having regard to what he has said in this House recently about water supply, but which would be contrary to some of the thinking in the department.

The ordinary householder is vitally concerned in this matter. Householders in some of our heavier rainfall areas closer to the city are able to organize their garden and household requirements so that they do not use excess water, and I have already said that 70 per cent of the users in the metropolitan area are in that category. However, it is not possible to do that in the country areas, particularly in the northern parts of the State. The people that I represent consider, rightly or wrongly, that they want to live the good life. To have a garden and some greenery around their houses is just as important to them as it is to people in any other part of South Australia. They realize the value of water too much to waste it, but in maintaining an ordinary household garden they invariably incur excess water costs, and they are the people who will bear the whole of the increase. I think that that is unjust and that the matter should be reviewed.

Our people think it reasonable to expect that they, as a community, should enjoy the facilities of a grassed oval for their sporting functions. However, the Port Augusta City Council, which asked me to take up this matter, will incur an additional impost for water charges alone of \$1,200. Undoubtedly, ovals in other parts of the State can be maintained without the need to incur this huge expense for additional water, but I am showing the imbalance in that this 20 per cent increase comes as a very heavy impost on people and that they take a dim view of it, particularly as ratepayers in Rundle Street or elsewhere in the city of Adelaide will not be paying any increase at all.

If this increase had been imposed of necessity while higher costs were being incurred for heavy water pumping during the drought, the householder might have been able to understand the need for the increases better than they have been able to understand the need when the drought is over and our reservoirs are full. We have not yet heard anything like the protest that we shall hear when the first accounts for the increased charges are sent out. People protested to me and, I understand, to other honourable members, when they received their last accounts, but they must remember that this increased charge for excess water has not been included in any account they have yet received.

I wish now to deal with our market gardeners, who will suffer from the increase. They are engaged in an industry vital to the welfare of South Australia. I shall speak especially of the market gardeners in my own district. If anything should happen to cause them to do what has already been done in the Murray River area, where orange groves are being ploughed in and orchards destroyed, that would be bad for South Australia economically.

Mr. Rodda: That's not through lack of water.

Mr. RICHES: They are not satisfied with the price available, but if people cannot pay for water there is no alternative to doing that in the area to which I am referring. This was an extremely grave problem for the Flinders Ranges growers about two years ago and representations were made to the then Minister of Works, who set up a special committee to inquire into the economics of the market gardening industry in that part and in other parts of the State.

A growers' representative and departmental officers conducted an exhaustive inquiry and I understand that they reported that a limitation should be placed on any expansion of operation. The market gardeners support this view. This motion does not in any way provide for expansion in industry: it asks that industry already established should not be put out of business but should be allowed to continue economically. The committee recognized that a reduction in water charges could not be justified but, after inquiring into the economics of the operation, it strongly recommended that there should be no increase.

It has been said that there should be no concessions, but I do not agree with this view. I point out, however, that we are not asking for concessions: we are asking that the whole

question of water rating should be reconsidered and that this additional impost should not be levied where it is proposed to be levied. If an opportunity for industrial development occurred or a mineral was found in a remote part of the State, every member knows that an adequate water supply would be provided if the Government was told that it was absolutely essential for the establishment of the new industry. If they were necessary to assist such a new industry, I am sure that concessions would be given and that electricity would be supplied. There is plenty of precedent for such assistance.

Before we allow these primary-producing areas to go out of production, we should even consider concessions to these industries. At this stage, however, we are not asking for concessions. This matter was raised by members of the present Government during the last Parliament. Water charges were increased and Sir Thomas Playford strongly requested that concessions be given. He objected strongly to any increase, particularly in so far as it would affect industry.

Mr. Wardle: Was this connected with rebate water?

Mr. RICHES: No; it was connected with concessions in respect of ordinary water rating for the establishment of new industries. Sir Thomas Playford asked for an assurance from the then Government that there would be no increase in such instances. This request was followed by a question by the present Treasurer, who asked that concessions should apply not only to new industries but to industries already established that would be paying the full rates. Members were very vocal about water charges during the last Parliament. The present Chief Secretary, when he was Leader of the Opposition in another place, asked that there be an equalization of water charges throughout the State, and I suggest that this is what we are requesting now. I realize that there is an equalization of rates, but there is not an equalization in the amount that people have to pay. The ordinary householder, who has to maintain a garden and provide for his wife and family the things that make life worth living, has to pay so much more—and he has to pay all of the increase. In relation to this matter the present Minister of Works said (1965-66 *Hansard*, page 551):

We heard only this week that higher charges for water and sewerage will be levied. This apparently means that, whilst on the one hand no provision is made for expanding industry to attract and keep workers in this State, costs

and charges to the worker will definitely be increased. Who is going to load this on the worker? Not the Liberal Government but the new Labor Government!

Well, the Labor Government did not load this particular increase on to the worker; the new Liberal Government has done it. The then Leader of the Opposition (Sir Thomas Playford) took exception to the way in which increases had been adopted and demanded of the then Government that the House have an opportunity to consider the increases before they were implemented. The present Attorney-General asked the following question:

Can the Minister assure the House and the public that householders will not have to pay an even higher price for water following the new assessment?

It seems that when members opposite are differently situated they have much to say about this vital matter. I expect they are just as much concerned today about the increases which have been announced and which have, in fact, been levied and that they will express their concern by supporting this motion. It does not seek to condemn anyone, for it is not that kind of motion: we hope it will appeal to every member. Indeed, it gives expression to what I believe is a fair deal for the people who are far removed from the city area, in particular, and whom I feel the department has been overlooking. As only 3 per cent of the people in the city of Adelaide and only 30 per cent of all the water users in the whole of the metropolitan area will use excess water and pay the 20 per cent increase, it behoves us to decide whether the impost is fair and whether it has been equitably applied.

I do not need to stress the importance of water to the industries to which I have referred. The industry just out of Port Pirie supplies the Melbourne market with peas and tomatoes that are not grown in glasshouses. An important industry, it employs many men, and this increased charge represents a real threat to those concerned. From questions that have been asked by members here, I know that this is also a serious matter in other parts of the State. I have received a letter from the Murray Bridge Sub-branch of the Labor Party stating that this matter is one of grave concern in that area, and I believe that it is also causing concern in the Barossa Valley. Perhaps in regard to the drier areas, where gardens have been longer established and where so many people depend on this industry for their livelihood, we should have a much closer look at the economics of the situation, and perhaps it should be examined more closely than it has

been examined personally by the Minister, who may not have had sufficient opportunity to consider fully all aspects of the matter.

Mr. BURDON seconded the motion.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

CHOWILLA DAM

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I move:

That this House:

- (a) reaffirms the resolution passed unanimously in 1967, viz.—“That the State of South Australia has a fundamental and legal right to the construction of the Chowilla dam without further delay, and that assurances must be given by the Governments, the parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement, that pending construction of the dam South Australia will be supplied in dry years with the volume of flow of water which the dam was designed to ensure.”;
- (b) regards the actions of the present Government in withdrawing instructions given by the previous Government to South Australia's commissioner to vote against any deferment or indefinite postponement of Chowilla, and creating a serious conflict with the Commonwealth Minister for National Development, as inconsistent with the resolution and contrary to South Australia's interests; and
- (c) calls on the Government to take those actions necessary to assert South Australia's fundamental and legal right to the Chowilla dam in line with the 1967 resolution.

In my view, the Chowilla dam is the most important project to be considered for South Australia. It is of much more significance even than the provision of natural gas, perhaps the provision of off-shore oil, or the development of other mineral deposits that may be discovered.

Mr. Riches: Or the building of a freeway!

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, or anything to do with the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study. Without assured supplies of water, the future development of this State must suffer.

Mr. McAnaney: It's good to see you are learning. They are different views from those of 18 months ago.

Mr. HUDSON: They are not. The member for Stirling does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. McAnaney: It's in *Hansard*.

Mr. HUDSON: Let the honourable member quote me the passage. It is not in *Hansard*. I have always held the view that, concerning South Australia, even our current level of development could not be sustained—

Mr. McAnaney: What about the final motion you moved in this House?

Mr. HUDSON: It was moved by the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) after members of the then Opposition had made statements they have since gone back on (and that includes the current Premier, in particular). Government members at the election made statements on which they have reneged completely and utterly (statements that they would build the Chowilla dam), but the first action they took in Government was to withdraw instructions given by the previous Government to South Australia's commissioner, namely, to vote against any deferment or indefinite postponement of the Chowilla dam.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Complete rot!

Mr. HUDSON: Is the Minister denying that that instruction was withdrawn?

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: I am saying that what you are saying is rot.

Mr. HUDSON: Let me quote chapter and verse. Is it not true that the Premier said in the debate last year that no alternative must be preferred? It is not right that the Government has withdrawn instructions that were given to South Australia's commissioner? Is it not right that during the election campaign Government spokesmen said that the Government would build the Chowilla dam? Is it not right that during the campaign they misled the people of South Australia with one of the worst pieces of phoney electioneering ever indulged in? People believed that South Australia would have the Chowilla dam and that there was no difficulty in the way. The Government's propaganda was specifically designed to induce people to believe that, and honourable members opposite know that was the case.

Mr. McAnaney: We said that you had made no progress on the matter.

Mr. HUDSON: We called tenders for it. What is the member for Stirling talking about? All this Government has done is to vote for the investigation of the Dartmouth site as an alternative to the Chowilla dam (the honourable member cannot deny that), and that is a complete reversal of the attitude taken by Government members in the debate last year. The Premier said that he would make political moves with the Liberal and Country Parties

in Canberra. What has he done so far? He has fallen foul of the Minister for National Development and made him a complete enemy of South Australia. That is the only political success he has had, and it is one of the worst failures imaginable. The Minister for National Development now says that, in the pamphlet produced by South Australia, there is only one non-controversial fact—the location of the dam site. I do not want to take the part of the Minister for National Development, but the Government's tactics were supposed to be (and this was the justification put up here and elsewhere for withdrawing the instructions given by the previous Government to Mr. Beaney) that it would approach its Commonwealth Liberal and Country Party colleagues behind the scenes, treat them as buddies, and get their agreement. They said they would use political tactics.

At a meeting at Berri (and you were there, Mr. Speaker), the Premier said that, by voting for the Dartmouth investigation, which enabled the Government to make political moves in Canberra, the Government had saved Chowilla dam. Some foolish people in the audience even applauded him for saying that. All members opposite, not only the Premier, must take the responsibility for the fact that the reaction of the Commonwealth Government is now more adverse than it was before. The Premier now says that he is beginning to wonder about the merits of having a Commonwealth Minister as Chairman of the River Murray Commission. We could probably have told him that we wondered about this ages ago. What possible report can the Ministry give to the House about the success of its supposed political tactics in Canberra? The major issues have not even been tackled. The pamphlet, which stirred up the Minister for National Development, is one of the most innocuous pamphlets imaginable. It is the sort of thing one might distribute to schoolchildren to put in their project books.

Mr. Casey: I threw mine away.

Mr. HUDSON: In relation to the substantial arguments produced against Chowilla by the Commonwealth and other States, the pamphlet is no reply at all. Surely, if the tactics of the Government are to have any success at all (which I doubt), they must be directed towards attempting, on tactical and other commonsense grounds, to convince those people concerned in the Commonwealth, New South Wales and Victorian Governments that the Chowilla scheme can stand on its own merits, that it can do the job for South

Australia, and that it can also provide benefits for New South Wales and Victoria. Is the Minister of Works or the member for Stirling aware of even the local pressures that must be bearing on the Minister for National Development in view of the district he represents? Do they know the district he represents?

Mr. McAnaney: Yes, I know him well: he grows oats.

Mr. HUDSON: He represents the District of Farrer, which is a Murray River district that includes Albury, where pressure against the Chowilla dam is the greatest, because people in that area believe its construction would increase the problems they have.

Mr. Rodda: Are you suggesting the Minister is being pressured out of this?

Mr. HUDSON: I suggest that the Minister for National Development has been influenced to some extent by local pressures that have developed along the Murray River in New South Wales and by the opinion of his colleagues, such as the member for Mallee (Mr. Turnbull) and the member for Riverina (Mr. Armstrong). Those members believe that the Chowilla dam will do more harm than good. They believe this because they think that if Chowilla is built the flow down the Murray River in New South Wales and Victoria will be reduced in a dry year and that as a result their salinity problems will be greater. What attempt has the Government made to tackle this basic question that is worrying people in New South Wales and Victoria? How can it hope to get the Minister for National Development on its side unless it can give an answer to him and his colleagues as to the way in which the Chowilla scheme can work effectively?

Mr. McAnaney: How long did you have to do this?

Mr. HUDSON: Only a few months.

Mr. McAnaney: No, this matter goes back nearly two years.

Mr. HUDSON: The problem with which we are now confronted reared its ugly head last year: it is the problem of salinity, which existed last year at Mildura. The need to maintain a base flow of the river to Mildura, if it is maintained at Mildura and points further up, will mean that New South Wales and Victoria will not benefit from the Chowilla scheme. The Minister of Works knows that what I say in this connection is correct and that, apart from the question of costs, this is the basic problem that must be answered. Until we have an answer to this

problem that will convince the Minister for National Development, the member for Riverina and others who are capable of being convinced, we will not get anywhere, and no amount of political manoeuvring and no attempts by the Premier to make himself a good fellow with the Prime Minister will remove the solid opposition that presently exists in Canberra. Let us make no mistake about it: the main opposition comes from Canberra. If Canberra gave the green light and was prepared to provide additional finances, I am sure that New South Wales and Victoria would go along with it, so long as they were satisfied that their interests would not be adversely affected. There does not seem to be any appreciation of this basic problem. It is no good promoting political support for Chowilla in South Australia unless the real and necessary steps are taken to convince the opponents of the scheme in the other States that their opposition is not soundly based.

I hope that when we hear from the Minister of Works later in this debate he will explain in detail what positive steps will be taken to answer the question of salinity, not because of the dam itself, not because of evaporation within the dam (which is a problem), but because of the problem of salinity if the flow of the Murray River in a dry year is reduced in New South Wales and Victoria so that there is a tendency for salinity to increase at Mildura and in surrounding areas. This is absolutely basic, and we can shout about Chowilla as much as we like: we can have a referendum on it and get a 99 per cent vote in favour throughout South Australia, but this would still not convert the Minister for National Development or those other people who say that their interests will be adversely affected by the Chowilla scheme.

The second really serious matter that concerns me is that, by promoting the investigation of the Dartmouth site to go ahead, we have given the green light to the people in Canberra to say that what we have to do is assure South Australia's entitlement to water in a dry year. That is not in the terms of the motion passed by the House last year.

Mr. McAnaney: It was the one the then Premier moved.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Stirling has made a blunder again.

Mr. Ryan: Does he ever do anything else?

Mr. HUDSON: It mentioned not South Australia's entitlement in a dry year but that South Australia would be supplied in dry years

with the volume of flow of water that the dam was designed to ensure—the water we would have got on average if we had the Chowilla dam. From the point of view of the future development of South Australia, we are not interested particularly in being assured that we will get our existing entitlement of 1,250,000 acre-feet or that we will get it more certainly if a dam is built on the Dartmouth site; that is no good to us. We want the kind of water supply we would have got on average from the Chowilla dam, and that is what we said in the resolution passed last year. But that is what the people in other States have been able to ignore, particularly since South Australia voted for the investigation of an alternative site. Members from other States and members of the Commonwealth Parliament and Commonwealth Ministers are now able to say, "Well, we need only to worry about supplying South Australia with its entitlement and, so long as it gets its entitlement, that is all right." We cannot base the future industrial development of South Australia on our entitlement as it stands at present.

The whole point of the Chowilla scheme is that even in a dry year it would on average provide South Australia with much more than its current entitlement. What we need to press home is that what South Australia wants one way or another is the kind of flow of water in the Murray River in South Australia that would have taken place on average if the Chowilla scheme had been proceeded with. Basically, we know we will get this if we get the Chowilla dam, and we want that as a first priority. The member for Stirling knows full well that, to ensure our future development, the basic entitlement of 1,250,000 acre-feet that we have at the moment is not adequate; it is nowhere near enough. It may have escaped the attention of the member for Stirling that the resolution passed last year was specifically worded to make that clear. This point was contained in the original motion before it was amended. The then Premier said all along, "All right, we want Chowilla and we will do everything in our power to get it but, if we cannot get Chowilla, then we want assurances that we will get a flow of water that Chowilla was designed to give us." That was the attitude of the then Premier all along.

Mr. Casey: I think you have convinced them.

Mr. HUDSON: One never knows. Sometimes they look understandingly and intelligently at one and one thinks, "I have got a point across at last", but later an interjection

comes in or a speech is made that demonstrates that one is talking to a brick wall or a block of wood.

Mr. McAnaney: The former Premier was throwing all his cards on the table and saying that he gave it away.

Mr. HUDSON: When did he say that? Members opposite made a great song and dance in the debate last year. I had better quote from it, because it gives the lie to everything that has been said since this Government came to power. It is a different tune now. Perhaps it is because Sir Thomas Playford is no longer associated with the Government. I am sure he is not happy about the situation that has developed and the actions of the present Government.

Mr. Casey: I think he has given them away altogether.

Mr. McAnaney: He was not too happy about the resolution last year.

Mr. HUDSON: Let us see what he said. He voted in favour of the resolution, and made a very good speech.

Mr. McAnaney: He has never made anything else.

Mr. HUDSON: That is not true. I know that certain members opposite regard Sir Thomas as a fairy godfather. He certainly made some good speeches, but to say he never made anything else is nonsense.

Mr. McAnaney: If he had been Premier for the last three years we would have had the Chowilla dam.

Mr. HUDSON: Will the member for Rocky River or the member for Stirling explain how the presence of Sir Thomas Playford as Premier over the last three years would have altered anything that has happened? Would it have altered the problem of salinity at Mildura? Is the presence of Sir Thomas Playford as Premier in some way magically connected with the salt content of the river at Mildura?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members had better have their argument over dinner.

Mr. HUDSON: There is a famous correlation between the number of storks crossing the English Channel each year (carrying babies, of course) and the proportion of all Church of England marriages in England. There is an absolutely perfect correlation! The suggestion of members opposite about the correlation between the salinity of the water in the Murray and the presence of Sir Thomas Playford as Premier is just about as ridiculous

and nonsensical. Had he been Premier, the problem would have been the same. Let me quote, for the record, if Sir Thomas Playford's record is so marvellous, what he said on April 21, 1960, when he was Premier. This is from the *Advertiser* so it must be true! He said:

If investigations prove that foundation and other conditions are satisfactory, actual construction operations could be begun by the end of 1961 and completed about 2½ years later. That would have been by the end of 1964, at the latest, and before he left office. He also said—again reported in the *Advertiser*—the following:

On present indications, South Australia's development will come to a standstill in 10 years unless additional supplies of Murray water are assured.

This is a statement of the utmost gravity, that South Australia's development would come to a standstill by 1970 unless additional supplies of Murray water were assured. Let me now quote to members opposite what the present Treasurer said in the debate last year.

Mr. Ryan: How could you hear him?

Mr. HUDSON: He was more vocal. He did not mind his statements being heard last year, but he is worried about them this year. It is to be found at page 1279 of the weekly volume of *Hansard* where on August 15, 1967, he said:

However, I believe that the project started to lose momentum in 1962 and that it has continued to lose momentum in the last two or three years.

There were problems with the Chowilla scheme from the word "go", problems relating to the foundations, to the wall, to the preventing of saline underground water getting into the dam water, and so on. These problems have plagued the scheme from its very inception. It is absolute rubbish and rot for the member for Stirling to try to suggest that the whole problem now exists because of the previous Government. The previous Government carried on the work to the stage where about \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 was spent. The roadworks and initial railway works were commenced. We reached the stage of calling tenders and it was at the very time when a tender had to be accepted that the matter blew up. That was in August of last year at the meeting of the River Murray Commission.

I remind members opposite, however, of the attitude they took last year and the different point of view they are expressing today. Mr. Hall, the present Premier, in that debate, as reported at page 1276 of *Hansard*, said:

We have to stand up to these negotiators and be hard-headed about the matter. We

must not give away even one inch. We must do all we can to have Chowilla dam completed and alternative works should not be referred to in the motion.

Despite what he then said, as Premier of the current Government he voted for the investigation of alternative works: there must have been discussion in Cabinet about it and he and other members must have supported the withdrawal of the instruction given by the previous Government to Mr. Beaney; therefore, they were prepared to contemplate alternative works. That was not what he said in August of last year.

Mr. McAnaney: There has been nine months of your messing around in that time.

Mr. HUDSON: That is an inane interjection to which it is not worth replying.

Mr. McAnaney: You took notice of it.

Mr. HUDSON: It was an interruption. Sir Thomas Playford last year was very strong and determined in his attitude. He pointed out that it was only the threat of legal action that secured for South Australia the Chowilla dam in the first place. The Chowilla scheme seemed to have foundered so far as the Commonwealth Government was concerned but, as members know, the Snowy Mountains scheme involved the diversion of water from the Murray River to the Murrumbidgee. Under the River Murray Waters Agreement Act South Australia has an entitlement to any Murray River water but not to any water coming down the Murrumbidgee. If water was transferred from the Murray or its tributaries into the Murrumbidgee, then a part of South Australia's entitlement would disappear. It was that action of the Snowy Mountains Authority that led to a writ being slapped on Sir Robert Menzies attempting to delay and challenge the legality of the Snowy Mountains scheme. It was the effect of that action that resulted in the agreement with the Commonwealth Government to go ahead with the Chowilla dam. South Australia then withdrew its writ. We had what we wanted because we knew that the Chowilla scheme would assure South Australia's water supply for decades to come and that South Australia's interests would not be adversely affected then as a result of the Snowy Mountains scheme.

The fact that Sir Thomas's belligerent action had been successful in the past was part of the reason, along with his general character, for his wanting to be belligerent about the matter again. Last year, as reported at page 1285 of *Hansard*, referring to the River Murray Commission he said:

However, it has no right to say that some other proposition shall be substituted for Chowilla. Chowilla has been approved after two investigations by the commission. The commission has no right to say that it intends to consult a computer to ascertain whether the computer has another idea. The commission has a duty to carry out the agreement of 1963, which specifically provided for the dam.

Mr. Hall then interjected as follows:

There is no mention of an alternative.

During the election campaign of the L.C.L. policy was directed entirely away from any difficulties that might be associated with the Chowilla scheme. The L.C.L. said to the people of South Australia, "Elect us and we will get on with the Chowilla dam." Undoubtedly, this was what the Premier said when he had his eye particularly on the Districts of Chaffey and Murray and when he had no concern whether he, as Premier, would encounter any difficulties about Chowilla or have to go back on his statements. He did not care whether the statements he made during the election campaign could not be delivered or whether the promise he made to build the Chowilla dam turned out to be false. His one concern was to produce a policy that would win seats, and he did not care whether that policy was practicable or not.

Mr. Hurst: How do you think those seats would go now?

Mr. HUDSON: It would be interesting to know that, particularly as it must have been clearly shown to the people in those areas that they were sold a pup during the election campaign and that all the statements made last year and during the election campaign were hogwash.

Mr. Hurst: Would you think that might affect those members?

Mr. HUDSON: That is interesting. When I was at a meeting at Berri, the Premier said, in answer to a question, that he did not know the size of the Chowilla dam. I do not know whether he knew how much of the Chowilla scheme involved the inundating of areas in New South Wales and Victoria. It is obvious that South Australia alone cannot build the Chowilla dam, but did the Premier bother to tell the electors that during the election campaign? Indeed, did the Minister of Works or any other member of the front bench say that at meetings?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: They said the very reverse of that.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. This was a piece of phoney electioneering of the kind that went on in my area.

Mr. Hughes: In my district they said, "Elect an L.C.L. Government and we'll get on with the Chowilla dam."

Mr. HUDSON: The same sort of electioneering went on in my district. While members opposite were saying in other districts that things were in a terrible financial state, they hoped to win the District of Glenelg by promising to abolish the winning bets tax, thus forfeiting \$800,000 in revenue each year! That was the seriousness of the financial position. Now some of the chickens have come home to roost and some of the falsehoods spread by members opposite are coming home to them.

Mr. Hurst: Have members up there, such as the member for Chaffey, apologized for misleading the electors over this?

Mr. HUDSON: Not at all. They are quite brazen about it and in my opinion they have been guilty of lowering the standard of politics in South Australia. I include the Premier in this charge. Untrue statements and untrue promises of the kind made in the election campaign lower the whole standard of political argument and are made merely to get votes with the short-term purpose of gaining power. The only thing that the Premier had in mind was that he must have power at all costs.

Mr. Hurst: This sort of thing would have an effect on oversea investors thinking of coming here, don't you think?

Mr. Clark: This sort of tactic usually earns its just deserts.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: No-one takes the member for Glenelg seriously.

Mr. HUDSON: The Premier says that no-one takes me seriously. However, the Minister for National Development thinks the Premier is incapable of producing a pamphlet with more than one truth in it. The Premier thinks now that the Commonwealth Minister should not be Chairman of the River Murray Commission. The result of the Premier's political tactics is that all he has done is get the Commonwealth Government more offside with South Australia than it was previously. By allowing the investigation of an alternative site he has given away our case for arbitration despite that by doing so he contradicts statements he made last year and during the election campaign. Doubtless he will try, in this debate, to defend his actions, but he does not care about his credibility, the credibility of his Government, or the general credibility of South Australia.

The longer the controversy between the Premier and the Minister for National Development about Chowilla continues, the more serious our future will become, even in the next few years. Any industry considering establishing in Australia and requiring a large supply of water must doubt that sufficient water will be available in South Australia, because of the controversy about Chowilla. If the thoughts of industrialists about establishing in South Australia or in another State are equally strong on other aspects, what has happened regarding Chowilla will cause the industrialists to go to that other State.

Mr. McAnaney: Do you think you are encouraging them now?

Mr. HUDSON: This motion makes clear that we disagree with the tactics that the Government has adopted. Those tactics are not in conformity with the resolution passed unanimously last year.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: You read your own motion and stick to the truth.

Mr. HUDSON: The Premier should stick to the truth.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: You are talking of alternatives in your own motion.

Mr. HUDSON: The resolution passed last year was not moved by the Premier.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: You read your own words.

Mr. HUDSON: The Premier could not even draft a motion and had to be helped by the former member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon), and even what he did then was not satisfactory. The final amendment was moved by the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill).

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Be factual. You know what forced him to do that.

Mr. HUDSON: That had nothing to do with the words that the then Leader wanted to use—nothing at all.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Stick to the facts.

Mr. HUDSON: I am doing that. The Premier's resolution last year was a lot of gobbledegook. Even he could not work out what the words meant, yet other people were expected to do that. It was an utter and incredible joke. When the Premier was out of the Chamber, I pointed out what he had given away to people in the other States. He can try these tactics if he likes, but knows full well that he has defrauded the people of South Australia. He also knows that he has made of the Minister for National Development a permanent enemy. He knows that he does not understand the basic problems of

Chowilla. To my knowledge, he still has not attempted to explain to anyone the basic problems of salinity up river from the Chowilla site, as distinct from the problems of salt content within Chowilla itself, and evaporation. I have never heard him explain this or give any indication that he understands it, and this is because he just does not listen.

As a result of the actions of the Premier, we now allow people like Senator Scott and Mr. Fairbairn to say that all South Australia is worried about is getting its entitlement. They have been saying in effect that South Australia's entitlement can be assured just as well by the Dartmouth site or some other scheme as it can by Chowilla. Even in the original wording of the motion moved by the present Leader of the Opposition last year it was made clear that, if there was any alternative, we wanted assurances about the quantity of the flow of water that would have been supplied by the Chowilla dam.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: You didn't talk about alternatives.

Mr. HUDSON: The final resolution talked of alternatives and did exactly the same thing, and the Premier voted for that at the time. That resolution stated that, pending construction of the dam, South Australia should be supplied in dry years with the volume of flow of water that the dam was designed to ensure.

For the benefit of the Premier, I point out that it would not be possible to supply the volume of flow of water the Chowilla dam was designed to ensure without having alternatives. You, Mr. Speaker, know very well, and so does the Premier, that the Dartmouth site will not supply South Australia with the volume of flow of water that the Chowilla dam was designed to ensure. It might assure us of the 1,250,000 acre-feet we are entitled to at present, but it will not go any further, and at present I do not believe this Government has even got across to Commonwealth Ministers that we are interested not in our entitlement but in a much greater flow of water being available to South Australia so that the future industrial development of this State can be achieved. I refer now to the pamphlet that has been produced by the Government. I have already said that it is an inane pamphlet, that it is the kind of thing that will be suitable for schoolchildren to stick in their scrapbooks.

Mr. Clark: I think you are doing the children an injustice.

Mr. HUDSON: No, it is reasonably attractive and it has a pretty picture and headings underlined in red ink. I believe it cost us about \$1,000 or more of revenue to produce. It contains inaccuracies, and some of the inaccuracies that are charged by the Minister for National Development have not been replied to. For example, the third point claims that the Snowy Mountains Authority, Soil Mechanics Limited of London, the United States Army Corps of Engineers, and the Engineering and Water Supply Department of South Australia all say that the scheme is practicable. The Minister for National Development charges that this is not the case, and that those bodies cannot be quoted as authorities because they were consulted only on individual features of the proposal and not on the whole scheme.

The basic thing wrong with this pamphlet is illustrated by that point. It makes no attempt at all to treat its audience as intelligent. It does not recognize at all the fact that the people who are opposed to the dam have used substantial arguments against it, and it does not address its attention towards attempting to convince the people that have to be convinced. This pamphlet has been so far a complete waste of money. Despite all the talking of the Premier after the April meeting of the River Murray Commission, and despite what was said on June 6 at Berri that action was being taken to present material to people in other States, all we have so far is this pamphlet, which is, as I have said, virtually worthless. It does not really address itself to the main question at all, and no adequate material has yet been prepared to send to people in other States.

Mr. Hurst: Has Senator Cavanagh received his reply yet?

Mr. HUDSON: I do not know, but he had not received one last week. The Premier's tactics were determined back in April when his Party first came into power, and after almost four months in office the necessary action to make some positive progress in this matter has not yet been taken, nor has any material of substance yet been supplied to anyone. All that has happened so far to South Australia's case is that it has gone down-hill. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 5.59 to 7.30 p.m.]

FRUIT FLY (COMPENSATION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 13. Page 576.)

Mr. CORCORAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): In supporting the Bill I commend the Agriculture Department for the work it has undertaken in eradicating fruit fly in this State. I think every member of the House is aware of the effectiveness of the department's programme in this respect. Indeed, whenever an outbreak of fruit fly has occurred in any part of the State, departmental officers have acted almost immediately and, in so doing, have been able to contain what might have become a serious problem in the State. The Bill provides compensation for people in Port Augusta who suffered losses as a result of a fruit fly infestation that occurred in about December last, and the sum involved is about \$3,000.

Concerning the time that elapses between an outbreak of fruit fly and the payment of compensation, I draw the attention of the Minister who is piloting the Bill through this House (I suspect on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture) that during the last Parliament we passed the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act which, although it arose mainly as a result of the drought being experienced at the time, related to any natural calamity (for instance, infestation of insects, a flood, fire, frost, or whatever else might be considered a natural calamity affecting the man on the land). Although I realize the difficulty of the suggestion I am about to make concerns the fact that that Act relates only to primary producers, I point out that the normal householder may also suffer losses (in this case, as a result of an outbreak of fruit fly). As we have to consider legislation each time an outbreak of fruit fly occurs, in order to pay compensation to those affected, I suggest that the Government examine ways and means of amending the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, so that those affected by the problem envisaged in this Bill will be compensated much more quickly than they are at present. I should appreciate it if the Minister of Lands could pass on this suggestion to the Minister of Agriculture and have my suggestion examined, particularly as it could concern people whose livelihoods were affected.

At present such people would find it extremely difficult to carry on, bearing in mind the time that elapses between an outbreak of fruit fly and when compensation is eventually paid. I make this suggestion simply to try to help those people who may be unfortunate

enough to suffer losses as a result of a fruit fly infestation. However, one can only commend the department for the action it has taken in the past, although I hope that such action will not be necessary in the future. In suggesting that this matter be considered along the lines of the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, I am not being critical: I hope I am being constructive. I am sure that the people at Port Augusta will be looking forward to the compensation due to them, even though the total sum involved is only \$3,000.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): I support the Bill, although I was surprised that it was necessary after the legislation passed last year. Frankly, I overlooked the fact that the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Bill applied exclusively to primary producers. I strongly support the contention of the member for Millicent that this matter should be reviewed, because it seems to me that a person suffering the losses to which this Bill refers has just as much claim on the sympathy of the State as has a primary producer, who in many cases is better off financially, anyway. I ask the Minister, when he replies, to say whether he has examined this situation and whether he does not agree that an outbreak of fruit fly may be considered amongst the calamities to which the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act refers. I should like to know also whether that Act applies only to primary producers.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): Although I support entirely the principle of the Bill, I differ from what the two previous speakers have said: whereas the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act relates to a natural calamity, this measure relates to a particular type of fly. Millions of dollars are lost by primary producers through damage caused by the blue-bottle blowfly, and that is an entirely different thing.

Mr. Corcoran: We're talking about the lapse of time between an outbreak and the payment of compensation.

Mr. McANANEY: I am referring to something that happens only occasionally. However, some problems are with us all the time and the Government wisely tries to remove those problems for the benefit of everyone concerned. Therefore, this is a special category. The compensation is paid to people whose loss is to the benefit of others. I give the Bill my wholehearted support. I believe this case is different from the cases referred to by the two previous speakers.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): I wish to make only a few comments in support of the Bill. I have recollections of the first legislation dealing with fruit fly and the payment of compensation for damage that the fruit fly caused. That legislation was passed in this Chamber at least 20 years ago. I commend Governments since then (whatever their political complexion) for promptly introducing legislation, when it has been necessary from time to time, to make available compensation to persons suffering damage as a result of the ravages of fruit fly. I believe legislation of this type encourages householders and others who have fruit trees, the fruit of which could be attacked by the fruit fly, to report promptly to a responsible officer of the department the fact that fruit fly or some noxious insect is in their garden.

I shudder to think what would have happened to the important viticultural and horticultural industries in my district and in the river districts of South Australia had the fruit fly gained a substantial hold, particularly in those early years when it first appeared in South Australia. It could be said that if the fruit fly had become established it would have meant saying "Goodbye" to a large and important market for dried fruit overseas.

I know that it has been said in the past that some oversea countries will not buy dried fruit that comes from countries where fruit fly is established. The viticultural industry, too, would have suffered a great and devastating blow had fruit fly become established in the areas where grapes are grown. Therefore, as I represent a district vitally interested in the primary industry activities of viticulture and horticulture, I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): Representing as I do one of the more important horticultural and viticultural districts in South Australia, I add my support to the Bill. I do not need to remind members opposite that I represent three famous wine-producing districts. From time to time I engage in a little friendly rivalry with the member for Angas. Even he will concede that the wines produced in the District of Light far overshadow anything that can be produced in his part of the Barossa Valley. I say "his part" because I share part of the Barossa Valley with him. Seriously, though, I think it is well to remind the House that our income from fruitgrowing in South Australia—

Members interjecting:

Mr. FREEBAIRN: This will interest members opposite, if they can forget about Socialism for a moment and concentrate on an important matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am very tolerant in these debates, but I think it is about time I established order so that we can get on with the business before the House. There is nothing about Socialism in the Bill. Will the honourable member please confine his remarks to the Bill?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The point I wish to make is that the fruit and vine industry contributes as much as one-fifth of our income from primary production. Therefore, members opposite will realize how important is this Bill under which compensation is payable to fruitgrowers who suffer losses as a result of fruit fly.

Mr. Riches: Do you think it is fair that they should have to wait for a special Act of Parliament every time?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Light.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I do not think it is fair that growers should have to wait such a long time, but I was rather surprised to hear the member for Stuart, in his speech, compare the fruit fly menace with other disasters, such as floods and fires. I point out to him that farmers can insure against fire and take out insurance against certain natural calamities. However, it is indeed difficult for an individual fruitgrower to have any protection against the ravages of fruit fly. I am pleased members opposite are taking sufficient interest in our rural industries to support the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): I appreciate the attention given by members to this Bill. I believe the first outbreak of fruit fly was recorded in South Australia in 1947. No rules were laid down as to what should happen in such a case other than that the Agriculture Department was given every assistance by the then Government to set out to eradicate that outbreak. Part of that programme was to confiscate fruit, and those confiscations were recorded, but no undertaking was given to anyone in relation to such confiscations. However, in the following session of Parliament a Bill was introduced (and I think I am correct in saying this, because it has been standard practice ever since) to authorize compensation for the fruit taken. This was an expediency. The idea was to eradicate the fruit fly at each outbreak

and, as far as can be ascertained (although there have been many arguments about it), the fruit fly has been eradicated each year.

I believe that outbreaks probably occur as a result of the occasional introduction of fruit fly from other sources. However, in certain years there have been carry-overs of undetected fruit fly that have hatched in a subsequent year.

The member for Millicent referred to emergency legislation passed to deal with primary producers in necessitous circumstances as a result of various disasters. However, the idea of that type of legislation in this case would require consideration. It is fairly obvious that an amendment to the Act would be required if the payment of compensation to people who lost fruit through the eradication programme were to become automatic. Although I doubt whether this course would be advisable, I will consider it carefully. The point is that no Government has ever given a specific undertaking that compensation will be provided in all cases involving fruit fly eradication. I point out that, if a widespread outbreak of fruit fly were to occur in a horticultural area, the amount of compensation might be so great that more attention would have to be given to the matter than is the case now.

Mr. Riches: The best way to combat it is by the co-operation of the people in reporting outbreaks quickly.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member is absolutely right. The most astonishing and praiseworthy thing about the fruit fly outbreaks we have had since 1947 has been the co-operation of the public, which to a large extent has been guided by the sensible administration that has organized the control operations.

Mr. Broomhill: That is added reason why people should be compensated as quickly as possible.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am not quite with the member for West Torrens; I think he is telling me that people should be compensated immediately. I will take up this matter with the Minister of Agriculture. Since 1947, we have had outbreaks of fruit fly but they have not occurred every year; we have gone several years without an outbreak. We have probably eradicated most of the outbreaks completely. Probably the new outbreaks occurred as a result of the introduction of fruit fly from other States rather than through carry-overs that have escaped the notice of the authorities. This is almost

miraculous. I do not know of any place in the world that has had a comparable type of infestation (that is, outbreaks in a large metropolitan area and sometimes in a large country town) where control measures have been as successful as ours have been.

We are at the stage now where, although we cannot guarantee that there will not be other outbreaks, there is no thought of giving up and saying that the pest has got away and all we can do is try to control it. This has happened in many other parts of the world. We have been able not only to control it here but to eradicate it on almost every occasion. This is to the credit partly of the people, who have co-operated with the authorities, and partly of the authorities, who have wisely appealed to the people in the right sense. I shall be happy to take up with the Minister of Agriculture the question of some other form of compensation, but whether this can be done under the Act that has been mentioned or whether that Act should be amended is another matter. This matter requires consideration.

I thank all honourable members for the help they have given. Parliament has supported the authorities in their attempts to repel these outbreaks and to eradicate them as they have occurred. After 20 years of successive outbreaks we are now in the happy position of being able to say that fruit fly is by no means out of control in South Australia. Apart from the cost of the control operations, the economic effect on the State is at a minimum.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Compensation".

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): I move:

In subclause (1) after "1947-1955" to insert "and that Act and this Act shall be read as one Act".

This is to ensure that "fruit fly regulations" and "committee" will bear the same meanings as they do in the Fruit Fly Act. This will clarify the purpose of the Bill.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 3—"Time limit for claims".

Mr. CORCORAN: I am alarmed that when a suggestion is made the member for Stirling jumps to his feet and says, "This is impossible." I mentioned the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act as an example of providing for a continuing facility to cater for any natural calamity. Whether that Act can be amended to include fruit fly compensation

is not of particular concern to me, but I am concerned about the time lapse between the outbreak and when compensation is paid, as legislation must be passed before compensation can be paid. This Bill should be looked at in the same light as the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act. I am surprised that the member for Stirling thought I wanted to compare the householder with the primary producer, although there are many reasons why a person engaged in commercial fruit growing should be as concerned about fruit fly as a primary producer is concerned about a flood or a drought. The Minister pointed out that it is not incumbent on the Government to provide compensation on every occasion, but I think it should be.

Mr. McANANEY: I said that this was compensation for doing something to assist the whole population, whereas the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act deals mainly with loans to persons in necessitous circumstances. Compensation under this Bill is to be paid not to persons in necessitous circumstances but to those whose fruit is destroyed. This is to help the rest of the population. I agree it would be a good thing to provide for earlier payments. I did not mean I was not supporting the principle in this Bill.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 13. Page 576.)

Mr. BROOMHILL (West Torrens): This is a minor Bill that did not require a lengthy explanation by the Minister. It arises from the need for an administrative change that has occurred within the Motor Vehicles Department as a result of the decision of the Full Court in a case that failed because the delegation of power by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles in the ordinary course of his administration was held to have no statutory support. In view of this, one can appreciate the necessity for the amendments proposed by the Bill. The only feature of this Bill to which I refer is that contained in clause 2 (b), which validates any past actions by officers on behalf of the Registrar in pursuance of his directions. One can readily understand that it is necessary to protect the actions taken by officers in the past under the Act and under the authority of the Registrar, but what causes me some concern

is that one can reach the conclusion that perhaps some prosecutions are pending that this particular power would nullify. If the existing legislation is not strong enough to enable prosecutions to proceed, it may not be right to validate any past actions of the officers. I ask the Attorney-General in his reply to indicate whether or not this is likely to occur. However, believing this is not the case, I support the second reading.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): Like the member for West Torrens, I think we should be informed about the retrospective effect of this measure. Just what are the consequences for prosecutions or appeals currently pending in relation to people who have been convicted under relevant sections of the Act? The Bill involves a delegation of power that was previously limited in scope. The exact terms of the Act were not adhered to, and this led to the prosecution by the department being held invalid by the Full Court. Now, legislation is coming before this Parliament seeking not only in relation to any past actions but also in relation to any actions taken from this point of time onwards to validate delegation of power by the Registrar or Deputy Registrar to others lower down; and presumably retrospectivity is necessary because of prosecutions currently listed or perhaps because of appeals.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Not only prosecutions or appeals, but I will explain this.

Mr. HUDSON: I think we should have an explanation, because retrospective legislation of this nature must be examined carefully and be fully justified. I well remember the rôle of a gentleman who was known as the honourable member for Mitcham.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I am still the member for Mitcham.

Mr. HUDSON: I well remember his comments over the last three years about retrospectivity, and I have little doubt that had he been in Opposition when this measure came before Parliament loud would have been his cries of horror and protest. In view of the past record of the learned Attorney-General in relation to legislation of this sort, I think members on both sides of the House should request from him a full and detailed explanation of the need for retrospectivity in this legislation.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I appreciate the concern shown by the member for West Torrens, followed by the member for Glenelg, on the score of retrospectivity. When I first considered the Bill,

I was concerned about it but the fact that I was prepared to bring it into the House should have set at rest the minds of the honourable gentlemen, in view of my past attitude on this matter. I can assure honourable members that this Bill is designed merely to correct a technical defect in the Act. Perhaps I can explain, as the member for Glenelg has invited me to, why the Bill has become necessary. The Full Court delivered a judgment on July 4 of this year in the matter of *Hinton Demolitions Proprietary Limited v. Lower*. In this matter, Hinton Demolitions had been charged with a breach of section 10 of the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act for failing to deliver an accurate daily record of the journeys of a vehicle along public roads; in other words, the company had been avoiding the payment of contributions under the Act. It was prosecuted in the Adelaide Magistrates Court and convicted, and an appeal was then taken to the Supreme Court. One of the elements necessary to be proved in the prosecution was the load capacity of the vehicle in question, and the only evidence of that tendered in court was a certificate issued pursuant to the Motor Vehicles Act, the Act we are now considering. On appeal, the validity of that certificate was successfully attacked. It was held by His Honour the Chief Justice and by Mr. Justice Travers and Mr. Justice Hogarth to be a nullity and, therefore, there was no evidence of the load capacity of the vehicle. One of the essential elements in the prosecution was absent and, therefore, the prosecution failed and the appeal was allowed.

Members may ask why the certificate was held to be a nullity. The reason is that the Motor Vehicles Act, pursuant to which that certificate was issued, sets out that the Registrar of Motor Vehicles may determine the load capacity and make an entry on the certificate, but the Act does not provide for anyone but the Registrar to make that determination. The evidence given on the prosecution showed that Mr. Davenport, a clerk in the department, had made the determination and that the Registrar had never personally directed his attention to the load capacity of this vehicle.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Was the clerk authorized to make these determinations?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No. The Full Court held that the Act did not authorize anyone but the Registrar to make the determination. No-one can blame the Registrar for not being personally able to make a determination in every case. The volume of work makes that entirely impossible, and it

has become apparent, as a result of the judgment, that the Act is just not in line with the practice that must be adopted in the Motor Vehicles Department but, because the Registrar had not made the determination and the entry in the certificate, the certificate was no good. On the hearing of the appeal, three grounds were taken, and this was one of them.

I hope that I have explained the matter in sufficient detail to show that it was a technical point but, nevertheless, a valid point. The decision means that no prosecutions under the Act up to date are valid or would be valid, because this has been the practice in the past. I am advised that the amount of contribution that has been paid under protest is about \$4,000,000. If this matter is not put right, we could be faced with a tremendous tangle, not only because appeals and prosecutions are pending but because a contribution that has actually been paid under protest might be liable to repayment.

This is a situation that I should think no member could contemplate with equanimity. That is why it is necessary to put this provision in the Act. It will not alter one iota what has happened in the past. It will simply make good a technical defect that no-one could have suspected until the point was taken in this case.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Appointment of Registrar and officers."

Mr. BROOMHILL: I was interested in the Attorney-General's explanation but he was not sufficiently specific in relation to prosecutions that may be pending, and I ask him whether there are any such cases.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I have not more recent information than that as at July 5, which was the day after the relevant day, but that information shows that on that day 519 cases had not been completed, the total of contribution involved was \$10,190, and the value of civil debt proceedings already commenced and in varying stages of process was \$82,050. That is for contributions that had not been paid, so six weeks ago more than \$90,000 was hanging on this, quite apart from the estimated \$4,000,000 that has been paid.

Mr. CORCORAN: Can the Attorney-General say why it is necessary to have a separate Bill to make this provision when the same matter, namely, the delegation of authority by a Minister or by an officer appointed

under a Statute, is dealt with in the Acts Interpretation Act Amendment Bill, which is also on the Notice Paper?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The certificate to which I referred in the second reading debate is made pursuant to the Motor Vehicles Act, even though it is used for the purposes of the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act. Obviously, we have to validate future and past transactions by an amendment of the Motor Vehicles Act.

Mr Corcoran: Because it is retrospective, you had to deal with this separately?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

Mr. Corcoran: The other measure is not retrospective in application?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No.

Mr. HUDSON: Can the Attorney-General say whether prosecutions pending have been adjourned, awaiting the passing of this legislation? If they have not, one would presume that the magistrate before whom the cases were heard would have dismissed each of them unless the appropriate certificate had been issued by the Registrar, not by some officer acting for the Registrar. I have not heard of further cases being dismissed and, knowing the Crown's general interest in preserving the revenues of the State, I should imagine that the procedure has been to have all these pending prosecutions adjourned until this legislation could be passed. Is this so?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, I understand that instructions were given to apply for adjournments of sufficient length to allow the situation to be put right.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ROAD MAINTENANCE (CONTRIBUTION) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 13. Page 577.)

Mr. BROOMHILL (West Torrens): The amendment in this Bill is similar to the one we have just considered to the Motor Vehicles Act. It is not of major importance, but nevertheless it provides for an alteration in machinery that is necessary in the administration of the Act. The main alteration is to section 13, a new paragraph in which gives evidentiary value to "a document purporting to be signed by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles or by a person acting on his behalf or by a person deemed pursuant to the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1968, to have acted on his behalf".

I can accept the fact that the amendment proposed by this Bill will not prejudice any defendant but will simplify procedures relating to prosecutions under the Act, and I support the second reading.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): The amendment contained in this Bill is clearly supplementary to the amendment to the Motor Vehicles Act with which we have just dealt. I think it is fitting at this stage to make the comment that when prosecutions on behalf of the Crown go adversely because of a technicality or a point of law, speedy action is taken in Parliament to rectify the matter, but when prosecutions go in favour of the Crown, although there may well have been no real justice in the prosecution and the original legislation under which it was carried out may well be faulty in several respects, the Crown or the Government of the day is not hasty in bringing about the necessary changes.

In my view, certain matters with respect to road maintenance charges badly need amendment. I refer to the fact that any truck over eight tons in capacity used for demonstration purposes in endeavouring to promote its sale is also liable for road maintenance tax, and, indeed, if the vehicle is being driven to and from a body works in order, say, to add a trailer to the prime mover it is still subject to this tax. A successful prosecution took place against an Adelaide firm, the name of which I can give to the Attorney-General, for permitting a vehicle to be driven from the body works, where it had had a trailer added to the prime mover, without having paid the tax, although no load had been carried at all.

It seems to me that consideration should also be given with some degree of rapidity when the boot is on the other foot. I can hardly imagine that it was the intention of the Act to apply a ton-mile tax when a vehicle was either being demonstrated to promote its sale or when the vehicle had not even been finally delivered to the agents but was being moved by road from the motor body works to the person taking delivery of it to try to sell it. These are matters of some importance, for they grate on people involved in the trucking business. There is general adverse feeling, as the Attorney would well know, amongst people in the trucking business in relation to road maintenance charges as a whole, and the very fact that there has been a whole series of court actions involving appeals of one sort or another is indicative of the difficulties that have arisen in this matter.

Existing anomalies which do not affect the Crown adversely but which affect a possible defendant adversely should, I believe, be cured at the same time as the anomalies that possibly adversely affect the revenue of the Crown or the Government. Also, it seems to me that the whole basis of the Road Maintenance Act needs to be further considered, particularly in relation to the eight-ton limit. This discriminates in favour of those who can use an eight-ton or smaller truck, and it does have an impact on the whole nature of the trucking industry because anyone contemplating a truck of a capacity between, say, seven tons and 12 tons would always go for the truck of a capacity of eight tons or less. The overall efficiency with which the industry operates is being adversely affected because of the way this legislation works.

When amending legislation is being considered to remove these anomalies of which I have spoken, we should also give an option to all truck owners as to the way in which they pay their road maintenance charge. It would seem that truck owners whose vehicles were registered in this State could be given the option of paying a lump sum each year instead of having to go through the whole cumbersome rigmarole of keeping detailed records of trips so that the exact road maintenance charge could be worked out. The Attorney will remember the legislation passed during the previous Parliament that provided that a firm could opt to pay stamp duties in one bite rather than be forever writing out receipts and fixing stamps. Special provisions were introduced then to simplify the whole procedure of revenue collection. These procedures have been taken full advantage of by business, and I think that if a similar option were introduced in respect to road maintenance charges it would also be of considerable benefit. In this sort of thing we would not be benefiting just the private truck operator, although obviously something that makes an activity more efficient and more economical is worth doing for that reason alone: we would also be increasing efficiency with which the Government can operate, because the administrative work in connection with taxation would thereby be reduced.

Not only are substantial administrative costs involved in the ordinary routine procedures of collection which could be simplified and reduced: significant administrative costs also arise out of the need to maintain inspectors and to conduct prosecutions, all of which

are costly and time-consuming. If arrangements could be made whereby this particular method of levying charges were simplified and made more acceptable to truck operators, I am sure that not only would the truck operators themselves benefit but also the Government, in terms of reduced administrative costs. I therefore ask the Attorney-General to take up with the Minister of Roads the matters I have raised and to see whether amending legislation cannot be introduced with some rapidity in order to deal with the loopholes in the Act and to simplify the whole procedure of collecting road maintenance charges.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Evidence."

Mr. HUDSON: As the Attorney-General has not bothered to reply, I ask him whether he will take up with the Minister of Roads the various matters I have raised in connection with the collection of road tax and the need for prosecutions.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): Yes.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

EVIDENCE (AFFIDAVITS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 13. Page 578.)

Mr. CORCORAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I support this short Bill, which is designed to enable proclaimed bank managers to take affidavits for use in any court in the State. At the moment it is possible for bank managers to take declarations and to attest the execution of instruments but not to take affidavits for use in court, and I agree with what the Attorney-General said in his second reading explanation: there is no reason why bank managers should not be able to take these affidavits. This will, of course, be more convenient particularly for people in country areas where there may be some difficulty in obtaining the services of a justice of the peace, who at the moment is required to take affidavits for use in the court. It will be more convenient also for people in the metropolitan area, who cannot contact a justice of the peace, to go to a proclaimed bank manager so that he may take an affidavit for use in court. Perhaps this could lead to the Attorney-General's examining closely the provision of

justices of the peace in certain areas, although I realize that a bank manager is often more easily contacted, because he remains in the one locality and is readily available to most members of the public. For the reasons I have outlined, I think that the Bill is worthy of support, and I commend it to the House.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (REDIVISION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 13. Page 605.)

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): Before addressing myself to the Bill, I ask leave to have the map showing the present electoral boundaries displayed on the notice board.

Leave granted.

Mr. RODDA: I think it will be good for all members to see the boundaries of the districts of other members. I have some appreciation of the great spread of the country districts, but I think it is only fair that country members such as I should see the position of the distinguished city members who have been putting up with the privations caused by so few of them attending to the wants of so many.

Mr. Hudson: Are you trying to justify these boundaries?

Mr. RODDA: As I proceed with my speech, the honourable member will learn what I think of the situation in South Australia. The Bill contains proposals that will change representation in the South Australian Parliament in such a way that the centralized nature of the population will be recognized. As about 70 per cent of the State's population lives around the metropolitan area, I believe strong arguments exist for an increase in the number of metropolitan seats. As a country member I hope that, although representation of country areas is to be diminished, our city cousins will not lose sight of the type of contribution primary producers make to the welfare of the State. On the other hand, I realize what a valuable home market means, and that this can be provided by a growing metropolis.

Bearing this in mind, it is well to remember that, when he explained the Bill, the Premier said that, despite the differences that had existed between the viewpoint of the great Australian Labor Party and that of the Liberal and Country League, there were issues on which they could and should agree in the

interests of the State. Among his statesman-like utterances, he said that one of these issues was the need for electoral reform and the alignment of the electoral boundaries of the State in such a way as to provide for adequate representation of all the people of South Australia. No member in the House will quibble with that point of view. The Bill provides for a House of Assembly of 47 districts, with an electoral commission examining the metropolitan area. Under the terms of the Bill, this will result in 28 or 29 metropolitan districts and 19 or 18 country districts. A proposal such as this is different from that espoused by either Party before the March election, and it represents a big change in the approach to this important matter of Parliamentary representation. The Party of which I am proud to be a member has come a long way in a spirit of genuine compromise.

Mr. Freebairn: I believe we have gone too far.

Mr. RODDA: There are many and varied points of view on this issue. At the March election, we went to the people with a proposal that provided for 25 metropolitan districts and 20 country districts. Members opposite said (and they made much capital out of this in the Millicent by-election campaign) that, if that proposal were put into effect, it would keep the L.C.L. in office for 30 years, and many people believed that. I think I heard someone say in this place last evening that had this proposal been adopted it would have been the kiss of death.

Mr. Freebairn: Don't you think members opposite are under orders to support the Bill?

Mr. RODDA: We know that honourable gentlemen opposite have their orders and I have not noticed that they have been terribly disobedient in the past when they have had orders. As I see my distinguished friend the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) smiling, I wonder what he has to smile about at this time. I was one of those people who believed at the time of the March election, when our proposal was being considered, that we should have provided for a House of Assembly with more city seats and more than 20 country seats. I also believed that there should have been some loading for the remote areas of the State.

Mr. Freebairn: Another "Casey Protection Bill".

Mr. RODDA: I am quite fond of the member for Frome. However, I was in the minority in the opinion I held in March, so I got behind the majority of my Party. The

election in March and the subsequent events in Millicent did little to indicate public endorsement either of the plan then put forward by the Labor Party or of that put forward by my Party. We are now considering one of the most important Bills this House has had to consider. When the Leader of the Opposition spoke in this debate, he referred to two main principles on which his Party approached electoral reform. He said:

The first principle for which our Party has always stood on electoral matters in this State is that every citizen in this community should have an equal and effective voice in his own government and that, therefore, electoral districts should be so designed as to provide a substantially equal number of voters in each district to elect each member to Parliament.

Having said that, he went on to please the ego of country people by saying:

The second principle is that in every area of the State sufficient service should be given to electors so that they might have effective Parliamentary representation: that is to say, they must be able to be in touch with their members and have their members act as agents for their district, because an important part of Parliamentary representation is not merely taking part in the deliberations of this House for making legislation, carrying motions, or passing financial measures: it is that every member represent his people as an agent and be their agent of government in any case where they consider that they have been disadvantaged by an administrative action. In these circumstances we believe that a decidedly larger House than the present one should be set up to allow for both those principles: the equality of voting power in every part of the State so that no citizen shall have a voting say in the making of laws different from that of another citizen and, in addition, that there shall be enough members in country areas to give service to their electors as agents for their people.

That was the text of the second reading speech made by the Leader on behalf of his Party. A little further on, he said:

I can say that the Opposition is prepared to accept a proposal for a 47-member House and that we are prepared to vote for the second reading of this Bill with the aim of improving it in Committee so that it will more nearly accord with our principles than it does at the moment.

Ever since I have been a member of this House I have noticed one paramount attribute of the Leader (not that I blame him—it is a rather commendable attribute): he always leads to his strength. This is a most significant feature I have noticed about the Leader. It is an innate characteristic. After pointing out some of the minor shortcomings of the measure, the Leader seized on clause 7, which defines the metropolitan

area for the purposes of the legislation. I consider that the drafting of this clause is commendable. The thing that troubles most of us is the definition of the metropolitan area. In any calculations I have done alone or with my colleagues it has always been difficult to come up with a proposal that meets the wishes of everyone. There must be a degree of anticipation when we look at this. Indeed, the Town Planner looked a long way ahead when he defined the metropolitan area.

Mr. HUDSON: Do you know the circumstances of that?

Mr. RODDA: He was taking into account the expansion that would take place.

Mr. HUDSON: The terms of reference originally included only the district councils, other than Salisbury, Munno Para, Elizabeth, Tea Tree Gully, Meadows—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Victoria.

Mr. RODDA: I am indebted for the instruction we are receiving from the member for Glenelg. When the Town Planner was looking at what was likely to take place in Adelaide, he was looking at it in the light of this 30-year era. The commission has been given specific instructions to define the metropolitan area, and from the reaction of the Leader and members opposite it is obvious they want to be assured that their Party will get at least 29 seats. I have calculated that their Party will get 29-plus.

Mr. HUDSON: I don't think so.

Mr. RODDA: This is the way I see it. Last week, the member for Glenelg said he should be suspicious of members on this side, but we are equally suspicious of him.

Mr. HUDSON: You have no reason to be suspicious of us. We haven't gerrymandered the districts.

Mr. RODDA: I have every reason to be suspicious of the member for Glenelg, despite all the fine words about members being good agents of our dear rustic souls in the country, who are scattered over a large part of the State. I advise honourable members to study the map that has been placed on the board for their edification. We might have 18 members mounting their camels, getting on their asses and into their automobiles, and giving what the member for Eyre has called a scanty service.

Mr. RYAN: That is what they get now.

Mr. RODDA: I do not know what the member for Eyre meant by scanty service, but he said that is what we will be giving to our people in the country. As a result of the

Government's generosity, we are giving members opposite not only the first bite of the cherry but the stone, too.

Mr. Hudson: You admit that as it stands now the Bill gives only 28 seats to the metropolitan area.

Mr. RODDA: No, the Labor Party has a good chance of getting 29, and I am not so sure it will not get 30. I am beginning to share the fears of the member for Eyre about the scanty service for country districts. The Bill goes a long way in a spirit of genuine compromise. We should not delude ourselves and the Opposition that we can suddenly become bedfellows of general agreement. I think we should remind ourselves of some of the inbuilt directives in the Rules, Platforms and Standing Orders of the great Australian Labor Party, which states:

1. Abolition of the Legislative Council.
2. A House of Assembly of 56 members representing single electorates, elected with a simple majority by the cross system of voting.
3. An independent electoral boundaries commission to provide approximately equal voting strength on the principle of one vote one value, in electorates subject to a margin of one-tenth over or under the average.
4. Periodical redivisions of electorates to provide for movements of population.
5. Pending the abolition of the Legislative Council, provision for adult franchise for this House and limiting its power to delaying for 12 months legislation insisted on by the House of Assembly.
6. Compulsory enrolment and voting for all State Parliamentary elections.
7. Resolution of all matters of wide social interest which are not issues as between the parties at elections and of deadlocks between the Upper House and Lower House to be by referenda.

If we look at the first line of that time-honoured pronouncement and reflect on the avowed intention of members opposite to abolish the Legislative Council, this Bill in all its spirit of generous compromise will not minimize the ideal held so tightly to their bosoms to banish the Upper House from our Parliamentary institution at the first available opportunity. Further, members opposite believe in the ultimate abolition of State Parliaments. We only have to look at what the Leader of the Opposition had to say on a *Four Corners* programme on June 3, 1967, soon after he became Premier:

Is it only a matter of understanding or is the problem insoluble? (Hon. Don Dunstan) I do not think the problem is insoluble. Eventually we are going to have to change the whole set up of the Federation, but this will take time.

What is the first step? (Hon. Don Dunstan) Well, I think the first step is the development of regional planning authorities in Australia. Our State boundaries are quite illogical. They bear no sort of relationship to developing economic communities.

Would you retain State sovereignty at the same time of having these regional planning authorities? (Hon. Don Dunstan) Oh yes, over a period. Eventually I think Australia will have to face having one sovereign national Parliament and a series of country governments, subordinate Legislatures. But the foundation for this is not here yet. It will take 20 to 25 years for it to develop.

These ideals go one step closer to achieving, if one further country seat should disappear by the compromise in this measure, an assurance, before the cutting up starts, that there will be 29 instead of 28 city seats.

Mr. Riches: Don't you think it would have been better to stick to the 26 country seats?

Mr. RODDA: Whether or not that should be so is past history. We are discussing a Bill that will provide for 47 seats. Members opposite have no mandate—

Mr. Langley: Neither have you.

Mr. RODDA: The Leader referred to the need for adequate representation for country people and for many who are not at all close to the city. One could go on for a long time putting forward a case for adequate country representation, but one thing is very real in this world: lack of numbers has always been accompanied by similar lack of achievement. I think that was underlined today by the member for Glenelg when he spoke about the Chowilla dam. One could give many instances of this but, when we look around the State, study the map on the notice board and look at the districts of Eyre, Whyalla, Frome and, I think, Albert, we observe that that is the order in size of those electoral districts. Then comes the District of Burra. Then come districts like Millicent and Victoria, which are hard districts to represent.

Mr. Riches: You voted for fewer seats.

Mr. RODDA: We are faced with a situation where, in a spirit of compromise, we on this side have come forward to give a measure of relief to the people of the State, some of whom are 400 miles away from the city.

Mr. Riches: You forced reduction of six seats in the country.

Mr. RODDA: I do not want to get involved in an argument now, but it is time we had some measure of relief. The 1965 Bill provided for 26 country seats in name, but only 18 in fact. With 18 or 19 country, it will be harder for country members than it is

at present. Over the years we have heard the stigma of "gerrymander" attached to the tail of the L.C.L. The Director of Planning has excluded Gawler from the metropolitan area, and we heard a great hue and cry from members opposite for the 4,000 or 5,000 people in that town to be included. Have they advanced a cogent argument why this should be done? There is something of a gerrymander here. After the March election there were cries throughout the length and breadth of the land that the A.L.P. had gained the greatest number of votes ever recorded by a Government in office. It was echoed up the streets of this fair city, rallies were held in prominent places, petitions were organized and people were exhorted with wrathful indignation to demand electoral justice. South Australia was said to be a disgrace to democracy, and that did not do us any good in many areas.

Mr. Langley: Particularly in Millicent.

Mr. RODDA: The member for Unley can make his own speech in his own time and in his own way. I live near the Victorian border and frequently visit areas immediately adjacent to my district.

Mr. Corcoran: Don't you think you ought to extend the border?

Mr. RODDA: If this Bill goes through, it may be a good thing for the honourable member and me to get on Sir Henry Bolte's band-waggon. I have been confronted with the suggestion that we are sitting in Government through a form of sinister trickery. That opinion has been put abroad by some of my friends opposite. However, I have spoken to electors in the western district of Victoria, and they have made no bones about the fact that their members of Parliament are not available to act as good agents on behalf of their electors, as the Leader termed them. We have had honourable members holding up Victoria as a paragon of virtue in electoral matters. The average number of electors in the 44 metropolitan districts in Victoria is 25,000. The average in the eight provincial districts is 22,250 and, in the 21 rural seats, 18,200.

Mr. Corcoran: Who held Victoria up as an example?

Mr. RODDA: The Leader of the Opposition made a grand pronouncement, as only he could do, with silver tongue.

Mr. Corcoran: What did he say?

Mr. RODDA: He said several things. However, I will not delay the House. The Victorian Districts of Lowan, Dundas and Portland

adjoin my district and electors in those districts have told me that the country weighting in Victoria is not now big enough. Those people are trying this apple pie that has been served up to us here in big lumps, but there is no sugar or treacle on it. The Victorian member has insufficient time to see his people and act as their agent in the Parliament of the State. Some electoral systems sound nice in theory, but they do not work out in practice.

How do we come out of this proposal? Any assessment must be purely speculative, because the commissioners have the arduous task of defining the metropolitan area to give my friends opposite, as I have said, the first bite of the cherry. The distinguished District of Adelaide comprises 15,000 electors.

Mr. Corcoran: It is very well represented, too.

Mr. RODDA: It is very well represented. We are very pleased to see the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) back with us. That will be a Labor seat. It would be fair to say that, in terms of this Bill, the District of Burnside would be cut into two Liberal seats, leaving an area to be shared with Norwood. I would imagine there would be one Labor seat there, for I think the member for that district would be in no danger of being defeated. However, either the L.C.L. or the A.L.P. could win in a swinging seat. Judging by the public opinion poll, the District of Enfield has the most popular man in South Australia, with 28,000 votes out of 46,000. I would imagine there would be three Labor seats there, and we could expect him to win one of those.

Mr. Jennings: It's a pity I am not triplets, for I could then represent the three.

Mr. RODDA: The District of Torrens has 19,500 electors, and I would imagine that the distinguished Minister would hold a seat there.

The SPEAKER: I take it the honourable member will be getting back to the Bill.

Mr. RODDA: Yes, Mr. Speaker. So it goes on down the line. With about 235,000 votes to the A.L.P. in the city compared with 155,000 votes to the L.C.L., it appears that the A.L.P. could win 17 seats and the L.C.L. seven seats, with five swinging seats; that is, assuming there are 29 seats, as I think there will be. In the country I think the A.L.P. will win five seats and the L.C.L. 11, with two swingers. This means there would be 22 assured Labor seats and 18 assured L.C.L.

seats, with seven going either way. I hope that assessment will reassure the people opposite who have been looking so worried for the past week or so.

My distinguished friend from Enfield took the long handle last night to my equally distinguished friend, the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell). I could only describe this as illegitimate skulduggery. The honourable member criticized the member for Albert, implying that he should get off his committees, forgo some of his city occupations and go back and look after his district, a district which, I might say, he very ably represents. The honourable member's majority is the envy of many members in this House, and I think it ill behoves the member for Enfield to use the member for Albert as a brick to prop under the wheel that is spurring my friends opposite to assure themselves of those 29 seats of which they seem so fervently keen to be assured. There was no reason for stooping to that sort of criticism of one who serves this Parliament so well, and I strenuously defend the member for Albert.

Mr. Ryan: If he's so good, why isn't he in the Cabinet?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RODDA: There is an obvious answer to that: we are a harmonious team, and we have plenty of people whom we could put in Cabinet. However, we loyally support all of those chosen for that high office. I support the second reading in a spirit of compromise: we on this side of the House recognize that the present situation in South Australia is not good. I think this is a commendable Bill, for when one analyses it one sees that an opportunity exists for a Government to be elected in its own right and to have a workable majority. Equal opportunity exists for both sides in this respect. However, like the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches), I regret the proposed diminution in country seats.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): The honourable member who has just resumed his seat said that he thought this Bill was one of the most vital measures ever to come before Parliament.

Mr. Rodda: And so it is!

Mr. McKEE: I agree, and I believe that this is a most unique occasion for the Parliament and the State. Because of this, I believe that we should approach the measure with extreme caution. It would be unlikely that a dictatorship that had existed for over 30 years would introduce legislation likely to bring about its downfall. During his speech the honourable member frequently referred to cherries,

and it seems obvious that, while this Bill was in the "tailor's shop", expert advice was called in from Gumeracha. I understand that, in his retirement, the gentleman concerned grows cherries in that district, and I think the House knows he is recognized throughout the world as a "cherrymander" expert. Obviously, that gentleman has been advising honourable members on this Bill. When the member for Light was speaking last evening—

Mr. Hurst: What did he say?

Mr. McKEE: He was making an effort to speak, and during his speech—

Mr. Freebairn: Are you going to vote for the Bill?

Mr. McKEE: —he attempted to hold a gun at our heads. He said, "I must extend this vital warning to members opposite."

Mr. Freebairn: And I meant it, too!

Mr. McKEE: I wish to warn the member for Light and his colleagues—

Mr. Freebairn: The member for Port Pirie will be stood up against a wall.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. McKEE: He warned us that if we fiddled with this Bill in Committee in any way we would get nothing, and the Bill would be shelved.

Mr. Clark: He would personally defeat it!

Mr. Freebairn: Has Jim Moss told you what to do?

Mr. McKEE: I think the honourable member has probably been severely reprimanded, if not last evening then today, because I do not think his colleagues would be particularly happy about his disclosing Party secrets. He more or less indicated to us that there were some niggers in the wood pile but that we were to leave them there. In view of what took place recently between the Premier and the Chief Secretary in regard to adult suffrage for the Legislative Council, I believe this Bill has a chance of passing this House. However, I think the big guillotine might be getting sharpened in the Upper House.

Mr. Ryan: Will they meet long enough to discuss the Bill?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McKEE: The member for Light also said that he agreed there was a need for a change of the kind provided in the Bill. However, in 1963 Sir Thomas Playford introduced a Bill on this subject and the member for Light voted for it, as did his colleagues. They thought it was a really good Bill. However, it would have provided the biggest gerrymander ever thought of for this State, and the honourable member knows that. Now he says there

is a need for a change. He should get a job with the Russian circus.

Mr. Clark: Can you explain that change of heart in such a short time?

Mr. McKEE: I am coming to that in a moment. In 1963, the member for Light was prepared to support a gerrymander as long as it would help his Party cling to the Treasury benches, regardless of the will of the people. I congratulate my Leader, in his absence, on the way he accomplished the extremely difficult task of endeavouring to bring about some change in the electoral situation in South Australia. I also congratulate the people of the State for supporting him so solidly in his battle.

Mrs. Byrne: And they will continue to do so.

Mr. McKEE: I agree. With other members of my Party, I believe that the fairest way to elect a Government is on the principle of one vote one value.

Mr. Freebairn: What about A.L.P. pre-selection?

Mr. McKEE: I will not deal with that or with pre-selections by the Adelaide Club.

Mr. Freebairn: What about the A.L.P. pre-selection at Port Pirie? Is that one vote one value?

The SPEAKER: Order! That has nothing to do with the Bill.

Mr. McKEE: Everyone in the State selects the members of my Party.

Mr. Clark: You challenge the member for Light to run against you.

Mr. McKEE: I invited him to come to Port Pirie for a popularity contest before the last election. He ran around telling everyone that there were Communists about the place.

Mr. Ryan: He was run out of the town, wasn't he?

The SPEAKER: Order! We are not discussing the member for Light. Will the honourable member please relate his remarks to the Bill?

Mr. McKEE: During his speech, the member for Mount Gambier read a report from a seminar of the Junior Chamber of Commerce held recently in Jamestown. This organization consists of fairly bright young fellows, among them being many sons of farmers and businessmen. The organization said that one of the greatest challenges facing democratic people

was to achieve democracy. Being a member of a certain organization, the member for Stirling would agree with me.

Mr. Nankivell: He has resigned.

Mr. McKEE: Anything would be an improvement on our system, which is known as the most undemocratic and vicious gerrymander in the world today.

Mr. Riches: You would not take the member for Stirling as being an authority on democracy, would you?

Mr. McKEE: I will have a word to say about him later.

Mr. Clark: He is an honest trier, at any rate.

Mr. McKEE: Yes. The Bill is a step toward some form of democracy, but the real challenge to the Government is to do something about the Legislative Council, for until the system of voting for that Chamber is changed there will never be a true democracy in this State.

Mr. Clark: The Premier knows that, too.

Mr. McKEE: The State cannot be regarded as a democracy if the electors are unable to elect the Government they want or change the Government. The voters could not change the representation in the Legislative Council if they wished to do so. I think the member for Eyre would agree with that. The Government will not challenge Central No. 1 District, as it realizes it could win it. The position is bad enough now, but can anyone imagine having 20 L.C.L. members in the Legislative Council? That would happen if the Government challenged the four sitting members in Central No. 1 District and it won the four seats, but it would not do this. If it did, it would bring public disfavour on the Party. Public opinion has at last forced the Government to make some improvements in this House.

Mr. Clark: Do you think the voters in Millicent might have had something to do with it?

Mr. McKEE: Well, I hope this Bill will effect an improvement. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 15, at 2 p.m.